

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

# The Classical Review

LIBRARY  
SEP 2 1920  
UNIV OF MICH.

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.  
A. D. GODLEY, Hon.D.Litt., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

## Board of Management:

Prof. R. A. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.R.S., Chairman.  
Prof. J. F. DOWSON, M.A., Hon. Treasurer. Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.S., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, Litt.D., D.Litt., F.R.S., F.R.S.L., With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.  
Prof. O. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A.,  
GUTHRIE BAILEY, M.A., Representing the Oxford Philological Society.  
Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., Montreal; Prof. I. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXIV AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1920 Nos. 5, 6

## CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	PAGE	REVIEWS—continued:	PAGE
Notes on Thucydides, Book VI. A. W. GOMME .....	82	Bywater's <i>Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England</i> . A. E. HOUSMAN .....	110
Some Emendations of Pindar. R. J. SHACKLE .....	85	My Commonplace Book. R. B. APPLETON .....	111
Lykos and Chimairæus. S. EITHEM .....	87	Aspects, Aorists, and the Classical Tripos. LLOYD STORR-BEST .....	112
A Numismatic Note on the Lelantian War. P. GARDNER .....	90	Le Culte des Héros. H. J. ROSE .....	114
Ticidas the Neoteric Poet. TENNEY FRANK .....	91	The Lewis House Collection of Ancient Gems. Y .....	116
Some Readings in Achilles Tatius. T. W. LEWIS .....	93	The Octavius of Minucius Felix. ALBERT C. CLARK .....	117
Horace, <i>Odes</i> I. 34. 7. J. H. VINCE .....	94	A New Verse Translation of Lucretius. C. BAILEY .....	118
Some Passages from the <i>Metamorphosis</i> of Ovid. D. A. SLATER .....	95	T. Macci Plauti <i>Menaechmi</i> . E. A. SONNENSCHEN .....	120
NOTES:		Postgate's <i>Phaedri Fabulae Assopias</i> . A. E. HOUSMAN .....	121
The Meaning of <i>ἐπαρτίς</i> in a Spartan Inscription. GRACE HARRIET MACGORDY .....	98	SHORT NOTICES:	
Further Notes on the Homeric Hymns. R. J. SHACKLE .....	99	Texts for Students. C. H. EVELYN-WHITE .....	125
'Plato's Definition of Colour' (C.R. xxxiv. p. 31). W. C. F. ANDERSON .....	101	Translations of Christian Literature .....	125
Bacchylides V. 142. E. J. BROOKS .....	101	A Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases. E. M. W. T. .....	125
Diogenes Laertius I. 104. A. S. FERGUSON .....	101	Horace and His Age: A Study in Historical Background .....	126
Plato, <i>Thraetetus</i> 188b. R. G. BURY .....	102	VERSION. H. RACKHAM .....	127
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i> II. 567-588. A. W. VAN BUREN .....	102	NOTES AND NEWS .....	127
Sulla and Cisalpine Gaul. M. CARY .....	103	CORRESPONDENCE .....	127
REVIEWS:		BOOKS RECEIVED .....	128
The <i>Ichneutae</i> of Sophocles. A. S. HUNT .....	104		
and E. A. SONNENSCHEN .....	104		
Beiträge zur Griechischen Religionsgeschichte III. H. J. ROSE .....	108		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.  
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free.  
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free.

## The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies,

19 BLOOMSBURY SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1

*President:* PROFESSOR J. S. REID, D.LITT.

THE Society embraces the history, art, and archaeology of Rome, Italy, and the Roman Empire, down to about A.D. 700.

In connexion with the Hellenic Society, the Roman Society maintains a joint library of Greek and Roman art, archaeology and history, and a collection of lantern slides and photographs. Members may borrow books and slides, and these can be sent through the post.

Communications respecting books and slides should be made to the Librarian.

Afternoon meetings for the reading and discussion of papers are held at Burlington House, W. Notices of these are sent to all members.

Life-membership composition for persons over fifty years of age ten guineas, for others fifteen guineas. Annual subscription one guinea. There is at present no entrance fee.

Persons desirous of joining the Society should communicate with the Secretary.

THE JOURNAL OF ROMAN STUDIES (11 x 7½ inches) is published by the Society in half-yearly parts, and sent post free to all members.

The papers in Vols. I.-V. include articles by English, American, French, and other foreign scholars, and amongst others:

ANDERSON, J. G. C. The Quinquennium Neronis.  
ASHBY, Dr. THOS. (of Rome). Recent Excavations at Ostia.

ASHBY, Dr. THOS. (of Rome). Roman Malta.  
BARKER, Miss E. R. The Catacombs of St. Callistus.  
BONI, Commendatore. Recent Discoveries on the Palestine at Rome.

BEYCE, Viscount. Religion in the Roman Empire.  
CAGNAT, Prof. (of Paris). A Roman Customs List.  
CALDERA, Prof. W. M. Roman Inscriptions in Asia Minor.

CALZA, GUIDO (of Rome). Roman Art at Ostia.  
CUMONT, Prof. (of Belgium), and ANDERSON, J. G. C. Three New Inscriptions.

DEBBAU, Prof. British Centurions.  
DOMASZEWSKI, Prof. The Magna Mater.

DOUGLAS, Miss. Jomo Hospita.

EDDAILE, Mrs. A Statue in the Palazzo Barberini.

HAYREFIELD, Prof. Roman Coast Defences of Eastern Britain.

HAYREFIELD, Prof. Roman London.

HAYREFIELD, Prof., and H. STUART-JONES. Romano-British Art.

MACDONALD, G. The Corbridge Gold Coins.

REINACH, SALOMON (Prof.). A Bronze Statuette of Zeus.

REID, Prof. J. S. Roman Public Law.

REID, Prof. J. S. Human Sacrifices at Rome.

STRONG, Mrs. S. A. The Archaeological Exhibition of 1911 at Rome.

WARDE FOWLER, W. The original meaning of the word "Sacer."

WARDE FOWLER, W. Mundus Pater.

Vol. VI. (delayed by the War) is in active preparation in the press.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, 2, The College, Epsom; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Pearson, Etonfield, King's Gap, Hoylake, Cheshire, and Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss Hilda Livesey, 155, Oswald Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Miss Margaret Hooker, Secondary School for Girls, Erdington, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss Wilkinson, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. Strudwick, City of London School for Girls, Carmelite Street, E.C.4; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss M. L. Newman, 7, College Street, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; and Professor Dawson, Northcote House, Apollo Bander, Bombay.



μόν  
αὐτ  
μόν  
δια

ha  
las  
on  
πλ  
tic  
wh  
So  
αὐ  
με  
κ.τ  
vie  
fin  
ho  
At

bu  
to  
ein  
ste  
Ho  
in  
etc  
nor  
rio  
run  
cun  
tur  
scr  
bus  
si s  
Ma  
Nic  
πα  
sed

A  
was  
tion  
fan  
oth  
N



# The Classical Review

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1920

## ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### NOTES ON THUCYDIDES, BOOK VI.

23. 1 Ἦν γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἔλθωμεν ἐνθὲνδε μὴ ἀντίπαλον μόνον παρασκευασάμενοι, πλὴν γε πρὸς τὸ μάχιστον αὐτῶν τὸ ὀπλιτικόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερβάλλοντες τοῖς πᾶσι, μάλιστα οὕτως οἷοι τε ἐσόμεθα τῶν μὲν κρατεῖν, τὰ δὲ καὶ διασῶσαι.

ALMOST every possible explanation has been given of this sentence in the last hundred years, but nearly all based on the assumption that in the words πλὴν γε . . . ὀπλιτικόν Nicias is mentioning a disadvantage to the Athenians which they cannot hope to overcome. So the scholiast, πρὸς μὲν τὸ μάχιστον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ ὀπλιτικόν οὐδ' ὅλως δυνάμεθα ἀντιτάξασθαι· πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἄλλα κ.τ.λ. The objection to this simple view is obvious: the Athenians in fact find no difficulty in facing the Sicilian hoplites, and no one (except perhaps Athenagoras—cp. 37. 1) was surprised.

Goeller did not feel any difficulty, but he had to distort the Greek sadly to obtain his rendering: 'i.e. wenn das einzige, worin wir ihnen nicht gleich stellen, sondern sie übertreffen, unsere Hoplitenmacht ist, und wir sie nicht in jeder Truppengattung übertreffen, etc. Poscit igitur ab Atheniensibus ut non solum hoplitarum numero superiores sint, sed omni genere copiarum . . . [the scholiast quoted]. Verum cum robur Graecorum in gravi armatura situm esset, qui graviter armatos scriptor excluderet numero eorum, quibus ab Ath. hostes exsuperari debeant, si sperari possit, hostes victum iri? . . . Maiorem numerum hoplitarum Ath. a Nicia tribui, indicant etiam verba τοῖς πᾶσι, non unis hoplitis par est nos praestare, sed omni genere militum.'

Arnold: Because on the one hand it was impossible for the Athenian expedition to match the Syracusan (*sic*) infantry in point of numbers, so on the other hand they were so superior in

discipline, that even with a great disparity of numbers they were fully able to cope with them. So also Poppo.

Haacke on the other hand: 'verba πλὴν γε κ.τ.λ. restringunt Niciae postulationem, augent vero timorem, vel certe periculum eorum gravius designant, quibus numero quidem pares Siculis milites conscribi possint, fortitudine non item.'

Boehme: 'also die Hoplitenmacht der Feinde wird auf alle Fälle stärker sein.' So Krüger.

Ulrichs (*Philologus*, 17, p. 347) proposed to read τὸ ἵππικόν in place of τὸ ὀπλιτικόν, so that Nicias then says that the Athenians must outnumber the Sicilians in everything except cavalry, which he has often insisted they cannot hope to match (20. 4, 21. 1, 22. 1). This is adopted by Stahl (ed. Tauchnitz, 1873). But to it Classen rightly objected that for no Greek state could τὸ ἵππικόν be equated with τὸ μάχιστον αὐτῶν; and in fact the Syracusans do almost all their land fighting with hoplites. Classen reverted to the scholiast's view, with the modification that Nicias is asserting the impossibility of the Athenian hoplite force alone being a match for the whole fighting force of the Syracusans, hoplites, light-armed, cavalry, 'ihrer gesamten streitbaren Mannschaft.' But why should they, seeing that they must prepare a large force of light-armed to assist the hoplites? As Stahl objects in his turn (Thuc. ed. Poppo-Stahl, *ad loc.*): 'nam etiamsi gravi armatura omnibus Sic. copiis Ath. pares non essent, possunt toto exercitu, et si hoc quoque non possent, omnino pares esse non possent, quod tamen Nicias sumit. Profecto ita copiarum comparatio in-

stituenda est, ut pars cum parte, non pars cum tota componatur.'

Hude and Stuart-Jones revert to the MSS. reading, the former recording the conjecture of Gertz τὸ ὀπλιτικόν τε καὶ ἵππικόν, which is still open to the objection that Stahl raised to Classen's rendering. So is Jowett's: 'It is better to suppose the words to be a qualification introduced somewhat out of place by N., and in harmony with the general spirit of his speech. "You must do all you can to be a match for your opponents" is the general drift of the previous chapter, and yet he throws in by the way "but in the great arm of war you cannot be a match for them."' This at least shows clearly the absurdity which we must attribute to Nicias by the ordinary interpretation of this sentence.

The explanation of Goeller fits in most closely with the true facts of the case, but cannot be got from the Greek. Arnold's implication that the words πλήν γε κ.τ.λ. are of an optimistic tendency (cp. Haacke's 'restringunt Niciae postulationem') suggests an easier explanation. Why cannot Nicias mean that in everything except the hoplite force the Athenians must outnumber the enemy, but in the matter of hoplites—for the actual fighting—an equal number of Athenians will be all that is necessary for victory? He has been insisting that in light-armed troops, in food, in money, in ships, it would be of no use to send a force only equal to that of the enemy: they must far outnumber them. In summing up he throws in the reservation that for the ordinary hoplite fighting force an equal number would suffice. He adds τὸ ὀπλιτικόν το τὸ μάχιμον αὐτῶν to explain and restrict the meaning of the latter, because in light-armed they ought to outnumber the Sicilians, and in cavalry they will anyhow be outnumbered. This gives a perfectly simple and natural rendering, and does away with the difficulties found in the usual view of the passage.

That the failure of the Sicilian expedition was, after all, mainly due to the numerical weakness of the Athenian hoplites (to besiege such a city a force superior to the enemy's was required),

is I think clear from Thucydides' narrative. But it is not unnatural that Nicias should not have foreseen this, and Thucydides himself seems to have been of a different opinion (II. 65. 11). It would be part of the irony of the career of Nicias that his one touch of optimism should have been so ill-judged.

The last words of the sentence, τῶν μὲν κρατεῖν, τὰ δὲ καὶ διασῶσαι, should not be taken, with the scholiast and many editors, to mean 'to conquer Sicily and indeed to preserve our empire here,' which would require κρατῆσαι and διασῶζειν or διασώζεσθαι; but 'to have the mastery over our enemies and to secure the loyalty of such friends as we may win over'—both in Sicily. The friends would probably feel a little doubtful about διασῶσαι; cp. Hermocrates' words τὴν ἐκείνου φιλίαν βεβαιώσασθαι, 78. 1, and VIII. 1. 3 τὰ τῶν ξυμμάχων ἐς ἀσφάλειαν ποιείσθαι.

24. 3 ὁ δὲ πόλις ὄμιλος καὶ στρατιώτης ἐν τε τῷ παρόντι ἀργύριον ὀσσειν καὶ προσκτήσεσθαι δύναμιν ὅθεν δίδων μισθοφορὰν ὑπάρξειν.

The great influx of slaves into Athens after the Persian Wars must have thrown out of employment large numbers of poor citizens, and imperilled the position of many small capitalists with whom men with large numbers of slaves would have been able to compete very easily. That the distress was not immediately apparent was probably due to the energetic military policy of Athens, by which many men were employed as soldiers and more as sailors. As peace was slowly being restored, attempts were made to find a remedy, partly by temporary measures, such as Pericles' great building activities, by which, as Plutarch tells us, nearly the whole of the citizens came into the employ of the State, partly by the permanent institution of payment for public services. A very large body of citizens was henceforth to do the work of the Empire in the law-courts, the ecclesia and the boulé, as γραμματεῖς, officials of all kinds, and as soldiers and sailors; and the subjects of this as of other Empires were to pay for the privilege of being ruled. Aristides, says Aristotle (Ἀθ. Πολ. 24. 1), συνεβούλευεν ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἡγεμονίας καὶ κατα-

βάντας ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν οἰκεῖν ἐν τῷ ἄστει τροφήν γὰρ ἔσεσθαι πᾶσι, τοῖς μὲν στρατευομένοις, τοῖς δὲ φρουροῦσι, τοῖς δὲ τὰ κοινὰ πράττονσι. Yet the pay the citizen ordinarily received for this in peace time was not large: only two and then three obols for service in the courts, whereas a soldier got anything up to a drachma *plus* his food. And service in the courts was not a daily matter. The position then was not good from the point of view of citizens who needed sufficient pay and security of position, and wanted their work to be confined to the public services. The Many at Athens, like the many at other times and places, did not try to improve their economic position by removing the cause of the evil; they did not agitate against slavery or try to modify its economic effects (for that cheap slave labour was at the bottom of the mischief has, I think, been made abundantly clear by Mr. Grundy and others). They only tried to better their position by taxing the subject allies, or, as in the fourth century, the rich, who had gained their riches by the very system which kept *them* poor. The addition to the number of their subjects of such a wealthy island as Sicily was likely therefore to give just such an increase to the pay and the security of the poor of Athens as they desired.

This then is the meaning of *αἰδίου μισθοροῦ* in this passage of Thucydides, not just 'they hoped to get permanent employment out of the acquisition somehow,' as Gilbert, followed by Marchant, renders it; still less 'permanent military employment' only, with Dobree, Böhme, Classen and Stahl. These editors take *καὶ στρατιώτης* predicatively with *ἀργύριον οἶσειν* and *προσκτήσεσθαι δύναμιν* (equivalent to *καὶ στρατενόμενος*): 'dazu auch die Macht Athens zu vergrößern; wodurch es nie an Gelegenheit zum Kriegsdienste fehlen würde' (Classen). But the average Athenian no more than the average man of other countries wanted to be a soldier for the rest of his days. Heitland (*Journ. of Phil.* 24, p. 6), though thinking that the *μισθοροῦ* is not wholly military, still would render *στρατιώτης* 'paid soldier,' almost professional, though not mercenary, soldier,

and would take it attributively, *πολὺς καὶ στρατιώτης ὄμιλος*, 'the great mass of those who lived by soldiering.'

But it is simpler to take *στρατιώτης* as a substantive joined with *ὄμιλος* by *καὶ*, when *ὁ πολὺς ὄμιλος* will mean the bulk of those remaining behind, and *ὁ πολὺς στρατιώτης* the bulk of the soldiery, in so far as these two classes are really distinguished. Those who remained in Athens on this occasion to carry on as dicasts and in the ecclesia had been or would be soldiers on other occasions; those who were going to Sicily were to come back to do public work in Athens; all alike hoped for *αἰδίου μισθοροῦ*. *ὁ πολὺς ὄμιλος καὶ στρατιώτης* is then 'the average citizen and soldier' of a city-in-arms, where every citizen was or had been a soldier. Very similar is VIII. 9. 3 *οἱ δὲ ὀλίγοι καὶ ξυνειδότες* (the reading of B, adopted by Stahl and Goodhart, against *οἱ δὲ ὀλίγοι ξυνειδότες* of the other MSS., and *οἱ* for *καὶ* of Hude), where though *οἱ ὀλίγοι* are not identical with *οἱ ξυνειδότες*, yet nearly all the oligarchs would be conspirators, and nearly all the conspirators oligarchs. Compare *παρὰ τοῦ καπήλου καὶ ἐμπόρου*, Plat. *Protag.* 314A.

34. 7 τῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ αὐτοὶ γινώσκουσιν ἴστανται, καὶ τοὺς προεπιχειροῦντας ἢ τοῖς γε ἐπιχειροῦσι προηλοῦντας ἐπὶ ἀμυνοῦνται μᾶλλον πεφύβηται, ἰσοκινδύνους ἡγούμενοι.

*Ἰσοκινδύνους* is generally taken to mean 'equal to the danger,' 'a match for it' (so Haase, Bauer, Poppo, Böhme, Classen, Stahl, Jowett, Liddell and Scott); and words like *ἰσόθεος*, *ἰσάργυρος*, or even *ἰσοχειλής*, are supposed to be sufficient parallels. Others translate 'equally ready to face danger' (Bloomfield, Marchant), and quote *ἰσοτελής*, *ἰσονομία*, etc., as parallels. But is either of these meanings possible? For the first rendering the first half of the compound, for the second the other half is not analogous. *Ἰσο-* in *ἰσόθεος*, etc. = 'like,' 'having equal powers with' a god, 'having equal value with silver,' etc. But 'equal to the danger' does not mean 'having the same power as danger' or 'like danger,' but 'able to face it'; and *ἴσος* does not mean 'able to face' a thing (*ἴσος τοῖς παρούσι*, Thuc. I. 132. 2, is perhaps the nearest to this meaning, but still very far

distant). Again, in order to establish the alternative rendering 'equally ready to face danger,' the second half of the compound should be from *κινδυνεύω*, which would have to mean 'to be ready to face danger,' or at least 'to face danger bravely'; whereas it means 'to run a risk,' whether bravely or not, 'to be in danger.'

There is only one natural meaning to *ἰσοκίνδυνος*, 'running equal risks,' 'in equal danger.' This the scholiast clearly felt: *ἦτοι ἐν ὁμοίῳ κινδύνῳ καταστήσαντας ἢ ἰσοπαλεῖς*. Krüger, 'nicht in grösserer Gefahr schwebend als sie', Arnold, and Jowett in an alternative rendering, 'remembering that the enemy are in no greater danger than they,' follow the scholiast. This is not a satisfactory translation of the Greek, which says 'in equal danger,' not 'in no greater danger'; and the Athenians (the implied subject of *ἡγούμενοι*) would not 'reflect that the Syracusans were in as great danger as themselves,' but 'that they were in as great danger as the Syracusans.' For this it would be necessary to read *ἰσοκίνδυνοι*, and I would accordingly suggest this emendation. For it is not possible to take *ἰσοκίνδυνος* transitively with the scholiast.

In the passage in Dio Cassius in which the word recurs (41. 55), it again means 'running equal risks' (and therefore *ἰσοπαλεῖς*, as the scholiast on Thucydides), not 'equal to the danger': *ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἀγὼν μέγας καὶ οἷος οὐχ ἕτερος . . . προύχοντος δ' οὖν πολὺ τοῦ Πομπηίου τῷ πλήθει, ἔξισούντ' οἱ σφισιν οἱ τοῦ Καίσαρος τῇ ῥώμῃ. καὶ οὕτως ἀπ' ἀντιπάλου πλεονεξίας καὶ ἰσόρροποι ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἰσοκίνδυνοι ἐγίνοντο*.

40. 1 'Αλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν, ὡ πάντων ἀξυνετώτατοι, εἰ μὴ μανθάνετε κακὰ σπεύδοντες, ἢ ἀμαθέστατοί ἐστε ὧν ἐγὼ οἶδα Ἑλλήνων, ἢ ἀδικώτατοι, εἰ εἰδότες τολμᾶτε. ἀλλ' ἦτοι μαθόντες γε ἢ μεταγνόντες τὸ τῆς πόλεως ξύμπασιν κοινὸν αὖξετε, κ.τ.λ.

So the MSS. and the Oxford editor, but no one else. The objections to it are well stated by Stahl (in Poppe-Stahl), who brackets *ἢ ἀμαθέστατοί ἐστε*: 'Verba Madvigio auctore [also Dobree] seclusa pro interpretamento habenda sunt verborum ὡ πάντων ἀξυνετώτατοι non solum propter intole-

rabilem eiusdem sententiae repetitionem, sed etiam quod ἔτι καὶ νῦν cum illis iunctum idoneam sententiam non praebet, quoniam antea nihil dictum est, unde expectari possit eos non iam stultissimos esse; accedit quod εἰ μὴ μανθάνετε κακὰ σπεύδοντες ita duobus membris ἢ ἀμαθέστατοί ἐστε ἢ ἀδικώτατοι praepositum est, quasi ad utrumque pertineat, quod ne cogitari quidem potest. Profecto qui accuratius totam sententiam examinaverit facile intelleget verba ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν adhortationem quae sequitur inducere et post interpositas compellationes ἀλλ' infra per epanalepsin iterari.'

Yet the resultant reading is not satisfactory either. It is intolerable to separate ὧν ἐγὼ οἶδα Ἑλλήνων from ὡ πάντων ἀξυνετώτατοι, especially as the latter is intelligible without the former. Other editors therefore remove ὧν ἐγὼ οἶδα Ἑλλήνων from where the MSS. have it, and place it after ἀξυνετώτατοι, at the same time adhering to the exclusion of *ἢ ἀμαθέστατοί ἐστε* (Cobet, Hude, and so Lamb, *Clio*, p. 302). By this time we have an intelligible sentence, but a great dislocation in the MSS. to account for; moreover *ἢ ἀμαθέστατοί ἐστε* is not a natural *interpretamentum* of ὡ πάντων ἀξυνετώτατοι by a scholiast or anyone else. If the sense can be saved by a simpler emendation, it will be so much the better. But good sense is obtained by assuming that γάρ (or δέ) has dropped out after εἰ, and that the whole sentence from εἰ to τολμᾶτε is in parenthesis: 'Αλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν, ὡ πάντων ἀξυνετώτατοι—εἰ γὰρ μὴ μανθάνετε κακὰ σπεύδοντες, ἢ ἀμαθέστατοί ἐστε ὧν ἐγὼ οἶδα Ἑλλήνων, ἢ ἀδικώτατοι, εἰ εἰδότες τολμᾶτε—ἀλλ' ἦτοι μαθόντες γε ἢ μεταγνόντες κ.τ.λ. If it is necessary to make Athenagoras strictly logical, we must also cut out *ἢ* before *ἀμαθέστατοι*. But it is not necessary; moreover VI. 59. 1, τοιούτῳ μὲν τρόπῳ δι' ἐρωτικὴν λύπην ἢ τε ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ ἡ ἀλόγιστος τόλμα ἐκ τοῦ παραχρῆμα περιδεοῦς Ἀρμόδιῳ καὶ Ἀριστογείτονι ἐγένετο, is very similar. There is too a certain point in the repetition of *μανθάνετε* . . . *ἀμαθέστατοι* ('if you can't learn this, you will never learn anything') for a downright, vulgar speaker like Athena-



goras, who talks like a schoolmaster to rough boys.

Early editors saw or felt the necessity for the parenthesis, but did not, so far as I know, suggest the emendation. Arnold, in his first edition (1835), suggests omitting *ἔστε*, but in his translation puts *εἰ μὴ . . . τολμᾶτε* in parenthesis. In later editions he wanted to exclude *ἄξυνετώτατοι* and *ἔστέ*. Poppo in his first edition (1828) suggested *οἱ* after *ἄξυνετώτατοι* and a parenthesis; in his second (1847) *οἱ ἢ εἰ μὴ, κ.τ.λ.*, with a full stop after *τολμᾶτε*, or alternatively

cutting out *ἢ ἀμαθ. ἔστε*. Böhme actually prints *εἰ μὴ . . . τολμᾶτε* in parenthesis, with the note: 'ἔτι καὶ νῦν lässt sich nur mit dem Imper. *αὔξετε* passend verbinden. Es ist daher, wenn man nichts ändern will, *εἰ μὴ—τολμᾶτε* als parenthetische Erläuterung von *ἄξυνετώτατοι* zu nehmen.' It is better to return to this earlier view of the sentence, but it will then be necessary to insert *γάρ* or *δέ* after *εἰ*.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

### SOME EMENDATIONS OF PINDAR.

(The numbering of odes and lines follows Gildersleeve and Bury.)

#### Olymp. XIV. 15:

*ἐπάκοι* v nñ, MSS.

One short syllable and a verb are required. Bergk coined a verb *ἐπηκοέω* and read *ἐπακοοῖτε*. Such a drastic expedient seems unnecessary, when it is open to us to read *ἐπάκοοι 'στε*, by prodelision or aphaeresis. I conceive that *ἐπάκοοι τε* was the first stage of corruption, and that *τε* was then struck out as needless.

#### Pyth. I. 52:

φαντὶ δὲ Λαμνῶθεν ἔλκει τειρόμενον μεταλλάσσοντας  
(with a variant *μεταλάσσοντας*) ἐλθεῖν | ἥρωας . . . MSS.

*μεταβάσσοντας* (Kayser) hardly accounts for what confronts us in the MSS. I propose <Fe> *μεταλλῶντας*, the corruption being due to attempts to crowd the more familiar *ἀλλάσσω* into the line. The sense 'inquiring after' seems appropriate, as the heroes would naturally have to make a few preliminary enquiries before finding a wounded man who had been marooned on the island years before. We should then place a comma after *ἀντιθέους*.

#### Pyth. III. 106:

ὄλβος οὐκ ἐς μακρὸν ἀνθρώπων ἔρχεται,  
ῥὺς πολλὸς ἐστ' ἂν ἐπιβρίσταις ἐπηται.

ὄς seems to be the seat of corruption; *πολλὸς* is probably sound, for, as Bergk remarks, Pindar is paraphrasing the proverb, *τίκτει τοι κόρος ὕβριν, ὅτ' ἂν πολλὸς ὄλβος ἐπηται*. Disson's *παμ-*

*πολλὸς* is too far from MS. testimony. I would suggest *τέως πολλὸς*, 'when for a while. . .'. The syllable *τε-* seemed to be hypermetrical, and was probably confused with *τε* 'and,' and therefore struck out. The suggestion *ὥς* seems unsatisfactory, since the word, comma'd off at the beginning of the line and carried over from the previous one, would have a strong emphasis, which its weak sense does not qualify it to bear.

#### Pyth. XI. 57:

μέλανος ὁ δ' ἐσχατιὰν  
καλλίονα θανάτου ἔσχεν ἐν (some MSS. omit *ἔσχεν*)  
γλυκυτάτῃ γενεᾷ MSS.

Whilst not denying the merits of Wilamowitz' *στείχοι* for *ἔσχεν*, I think that *ἔσχεν* derives some support from the fact that Pindar associates *ἔσχατος* and *ἔσχεν* in *Nem. X. 32* (v. Bury *ad loc.*) and *Isthm. VI. 36*. If Pindar did not actually connect the words etymologically, he may very possibly have liked the assonance. Therefore perhaps he wrote here *θανάτοι' ἔσχεν*. For the elision of genitive termination in *-οιο* cf. *Nem. IX. 55* (*σκοποῖ' ἀγχιστα*), *Ol. XIII. 35*, *Pyth. I. 39*, *Isthm. I. 16*, *Bacchylides V. 62* (*ἀπλάτοι' Ἐχίδνας*), and *X. 120*. The omission of *ἔσχεν* in some MSS. is perhaps due to an erasion preparatory to making a correction of the hiatus, which was never carried

out; cf. the omission of *πλούτῳ* by B and *Ῥ* in *Nem.* XI. 41.

*Nem.* IV. 90:

τὸν Εὐφάνης ἐθέλων γεραίος προπάτωρ	89
† ὁ σὸς ἀείσεται, παῖ. †	90
ἄλλοισι δ' ἄλικες ἄλλοι.	91

Metre requires in 90  $\cup - \cup - \cup \cup -$ . Read perhaps either *εἰς ἀείσε' κ' ἐταῖς*, 'with a ready spirit Euphanes would have sung of him to his comrades' (had he had the chance before death cut him off), or *εἰς ἀείσεν ἐταῖς*. The *ἔται* will correspond to the *ἄλικες* of 91. In either case *εἰς ἀείσεται* would be the intermediate stage of corruption (in the first suggestion, perhaps in uncials, *ΑΕΙΣΕΚΕΤΑΙΟ*). *εἰς*, being then devoid of sense, was altered to *ὁ σός*, *παῖ* being added to explain the reference of *σός* and fill out the line to the requisite number of syllables.

*Nem.* VII. 33:

βοαθῶν, τοὶ γὰρ ὁ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν κ.τ.λ.

Didymus' *παρὰ* for *γὰρ* seems too easy a word to suffer alteration. Perhaps *τοὶ γ' ἄρα*, *τοὶ* then being relative.

*Nem.* IX. 25:

ὁ δ' Ἀμφιάρη	{ <i>σχίσαις</i> (B first hand, B) <i>κερανῶ</i> . . . 24
	{ <i>σχίσειν</i> (D)
	{ <i>σχίσε</i> (B second hand).

Zeus τὰν βαθύστερνον χθόνα, κρύψεν δ' ἄμ' ἵπποις  
(all MSS.) 25.

Professor Bury argues very soundly that *σχίσειν* could not give rise to *σχίσαις*; the converse process, I hope to show, would be easy. *σχίσαις* with *κρύψεν δ'* in 25 gives an anacoluthon. *κρύψ' <ἄνδρ' > ἄμ' ἵπποις*, Professor Bury, on the strength of a supposed responson; but again the word is too common to be likely to suffer corruption. More probable, perhaps, would be *Fe*, thus: *κρύψεν F' ἄμ' ἵπποις*. The digamma was of course lost, and the metre restored by the insertion of *δ'* in its place. This involved the further alteration of *σχίσαις* (the form necessary for metre) to *σχίσειν*.

*Isthm.* I. 41:

<i>ἀρεταῖ</i>	{	<i>κατάκειται</i> B
<i>ἀρεταί</i>		
<i>ἀρετᾶ</i> <i>κατάκειται</i> D.		

The received explanation that *κατάκειται* = incumbit 'expends his efforts on,' is very dubious. Professor Bury receives Bergk's *ἀνάκειται* into his text,

in the sense of 'is devoted, dedicated to deeds of excellence.' Its use, however, apart from inanimate offerings, is hard to parallel. In Eur. *Bacch.* 934 *σοὶ γὰρ ἀνακείμεσθα δῆ*, the words seem to imply merely that Pentheus is a helpless thing in the god's power. More plausible as sense, and not much worse palaeographically, would be *ποτίκειται*; for confusions of *π* and *κ* compare perhaps the scholiast's *κατὰ* for *παρὰ* in *Pyth.* X. 4.

*Isthm.* V. 36:

ἀλλ' Διὰ κίδα ἀκλέων	35
ἐς πλὸν κήρσσε δαινυμένων B	36
ἐς πλὸν κήρσσε δαινυμένων D	

The scholiast might seem to imply *δαινύμενον*, but in view of the consensus of MSS. and the improbability that it would give rise to *δαινυμένων*, I think we may regard *δαινύμενον* and conjectures which depend on it as out of court. No attempt to supply the metrical deficiency can be more than plausible, but it may be suggested that *<κούρων> κήρσσε δαινυμένων* would be a more plausible solution than some that have been advanced. As Telamon had no child, he is probably conceived as a *κούρος* himself. This suggestion leaves a loophole for lipography, which other conjectures do not (e.g. Triclinius' *πάντων*). *Il.* Δ. 385 *κιχήσατο Καδμείωνας* | *δαινυμένους* supports *κήρσσε* here as against *κήρσσε*, *κάρυξε*, etc.

*Isthm.* VI. 8:

ἦρ' ἀμφὶ Τειρεσίᾳο πυκναῖς βουλαῖς MSS.

The simplest cure for the metre would seem to be *ἦτ' ἀμφὶ Τειρεσίᾳο πυκναῖς βουλαῖς*.

*Isthm.* VI. 28:

δοτὶς . . . χάλαζαν αἵματος . . . ἀμύνεται,	27
λοιγὸν † ἀμύνων † ἐναντίῳ στρατῶ.	28

Metre and sense are violated by *ἀμύνων*, which is evidently a dittography from *ἀμύνεται* above. Metre requires  $\cup \cup -$ . As *ἀμύνεται* in MSS. would not fall immediately above the corrupted word, it is probable that the latter bore a considerable graphical resemblance to it; otherwise it would scarcely have been affected by it. The conjectures *ἀντιφέρων* (Bergk), *ἀντιτίτων* (Hermann), *ἄντα τρέπων* (Bury), *ἀμπεπαλῶν* (Mommson), hardly satisfy this

condition. I suggest that the truth is ἀντανύων (= ἀνα-τανύων = ἀνατείνων). The form ἀντανύω occurs in Callim. *hymn. Jov.* 30. For the sense of ἀνατείνω = 'to hold out threateningly,' cp. τὴν μάχαιραν ἀνατεταμένους Xen. *Cyr.* 4. 1. 2; οὐδὲ Πολυδεύκης βία χεῖρας ἀντείνειτ' ἂν ἐναντίον αὐτῷ Simonides 8 [20] (Bergk); οὐδὲν ἂν ὑμῖν εἶχε ἀνατεινᾶσθαι φοβερόν Demosth. 389. 1, etc. Corruption of ἀντανύων was perhaps due to a lipography in the first instance, resulting in λαιγοναννον; the remnant was then either altered to ἀμύνων on the model of ἀμύνεται above, or simply further corrupted from it by a ditto-graphy.

*Isthm.* VII. 13:

τὸ δὲ πρὸ ποδὸς ἀρειον ἀεὶ | χρῆμα MSS.

Again metrically deficient. Here, too, most of the suggestions can show no motive for loss. The scholiast has πᾶν δὲ προσήκει τὸ παρὰ πόδας πρᾶγμα σκοπεῖν καὶ εὖ διαπιθέσθαι. § ἀεὶ δὲ βέλτιον ἔστι πᾶν τὸ παρὰ πόδας πρᾶγμα προσβλέπειν. Hence ἀεὶ <σκοπεῖν> Dissen. But the fact that the scholia paraphrase by three different words makes it unlikely that any one of those words occurred in their text. It may be suggested that they had before them ἀεὶ <νοεῖν>: cp. *Ol.* XIII. 48, *Nem.* V. 18. That this should prove a stumbling-block to copyists would be no matter for surprise (ΑΡΕΙΟΝ Α Ε Ι Ν Ο Ε Ι Ν).

R. J. SHACKLE.

Trinity College,  
Cambridge.

## LYKOS AND CHIMAIREUS.

IN the *Oxyrhynch. Pap.*, no. 1011, 12 ff., we read about Cydippe that she was seized by the sickness 'that we send out into the wild goats and falsely call sacred.'

... τὴν δ' εἶλε κακὸς χλὸς, εἶλε δὲ νοῦσος  
αἴγας ἐς ἀγριάδας τὴν ἀποπεμπόμεθα,  
ψευδόμενοι δ' ἱερὴν φημίζομεν, ἥ τὸτ' ἀνιγρή  
τὴν κούρην α[ὐτ]ῶ <ν> μέχρις ἔτηξε δομῶν.

Dr. Hunt, in his annotation to the verse, refers to Hesych. *Philostr. her.* p. 148, Boisson. εὐχόμεθα οὖν Ἀπόλλωνι Λυκίῳ τε καὶ Φυξίῳ, . . . τὴν νόσον δὲ εἰς αἴγας, φασί, τρέψαι, and Suid. s.v. κατ' αἴγας ἀγρίας, finally to Hippocr. *de morbo comit. ad init.* We may add Plin. *h. n.* VIII. § 115 and XXVIII. 226 (against epilepsy you have to fumigate with goat's or stag's horn; you heal it with *carnes caprinae in rogo hominis tostae*), Kyran. II. 1, 47 de Μέλυ καπνιζομένη (sc. goat's skin) ληθαργικούς διεγείρει καὶ τοὺς πίπτοντας ἐπιληπτικούς καὶ τὰς ὑστερικὰς πνιγμονάς, καὶ αἱ τρίχες καπνιζόμεναι τὰ αὐτὰ ποιοῦσι κατ' ἐνέργειαν. The disease of the Proitides—that according to Roscher's view was a sort of falling sickness—is said to have been cured by the milk of goats which were fed by helleborus, Plin. *h. n.* XXV. 21. The same observation holds good of goat's

blood, cp. Ps. Victor, *de vir. ill.* 66, Marcus Livius Drusus trib. pl. : ' . . . repente in publico concidit sive morbo comitiali seu hausto caprino sanguine, semianimis domum relatus.' That wolf's skin or hair sometimes produced a similar effect we may guess from the general superstitious character that the ancient attached to this animal, cp. e.g. Plin. XXVIII. 157 and 257, from Kyran. II. 11, 12 (drinking wolf's blood makes the drinker incurably insane—that is the reverse side to the same idea). It is tempting to compare a personal name as Ἀλκο-λύκα (*J.G.* IX. 2, nr. 1337) with the Ἀλεξίδα, the ancestress of a family which believed to possess a curative method against epilepsy (*Plut. quaest. Gr.* 23). We may also refer to the Grove of *Lycus*, where the *mystae* of Andania were purified, Paus. IV. 1, 6, Λύκου δρυμὸν ἔτι ὀνομάζουσιν ἔνθα ἐκάθηρε τοὺς μύστας (in the same way in Athens the λύκοι or 'outcasts' may originally have been purified in the Lykeion).

Then we have, according to Callimachus in the *Aetia* (see above), Apollo Lykios, and Phyxios. Moreover, we know from Eleutherai on the Cithaeron Dionysos Μελάναιγος who had made the daughters of Eleuther insane. But Apollo, as well as Artemis, is the proper

god for healing such diseases. In Lokroi and Rhegion there once broke out an epidemical frenzy amongst the women, and by order of the Delphian oracle they had to sing sixty pæans of spring on the twelfth day in order to be cured (*Apoll. hist. mir.* 40, p. 113, West.). The combination of wolf and goat are met with in *Pap. Berol.* II. 141, just in the invocation of Apollo: *ποίησις τῆς πράξεως· τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὄνυχας προβάτου, τῇ δευτέρᾳ αἰγὸς ὄνυχας, τῇ τρίτῃ λύκου τρίχας ἢ ἀστράγαλον* (you note the climax, wolf's hair is the strongest ingredient of them all). But in the cult of Asklepios and Apollo in Erythrai (Wilamowitz, *Nordionische Steine*, nr. 11, l. 9) exactly the contrary way of offering was enforced: *[μη]δὲ αἰγίφῃ μ[η]δὲ . . .*

We have to bear all this in mind when we read in the inscription of the Delphian Labyadae (*Ditt. Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 438, 194 ff.) about the *χίμαιρα* of the *δυωδεκαίς* and *τὰ τῶι Λυκίῳ δάρματα*, which forthwith shall fall to the share of Buzya, daughter of Phanotos. According to a different tradition, Buzya was the daughter of Λύκος, not of Phanotos (or Panopos, Phanoteus), schol. *Apoll. Rhod.* I. 185. Then a young billy-goat plays a rôle in the story of Harpa-λύκη; this heroine, as well as Harpa-λυκος, belongs to the same town on the frontier of Phocis and Boeotia (cp. the articles 'Harpalyke,' 'Harpalykos,' in Roscher's *Lex.* and the *Realencykl.*, then Gruppe, *Griech. Mythol.* 220 and 1294). This combination of λύκος and χίμαιρα we meet again, remarkable to state, in the brethren Lykos and Chimaireus in Troas, sons of Prometheus (*Lykophr.* 132, withschol. and Tzetzes). During a pestilence in Sparta Menelaos was sent off to Troas to propitiate the brethren, *τοὺς ἐν Τροίᾳ κρονίου δαίμονας*, schol. min. II. V. 64 (in Thymbra? s the sagacious supposition of Gruppe, basing upon *θύμβρα* or *cumila* as food of goats, *l.c.* 306 and 1390, note 5). Consequently we have to suppose that this pair of daemons can cause and heal pestilence (perhaps we have to think of λιμός too [this is the writing of codd. *LT*], not only of λοιμός, and refer the *κρόνιοι δαίμονες* to Kronos as the god of harvest, although

*κρονοδαίμων*, according to Bekker, *Anecd.* 46, 30, only is used *ἐπὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ καὶ εὐηθοῦς*). Their parents are said to have been Prometheus and Kelaino, and Prometheus takes us back directly to Panopeus in Phokis, where they told of Prometheus as the maker of man (*Paus.* X. 4, 4), but as to the cultstatue in the same place, they questioned whether to call it Asclepius or Prometheus (*Paus. ib.*). Prometheus himself was in Delphi the ancestor of the sacerdotal family, out of which the *Ὀσίοι* were elected.

It would be tempting here to make use of Gruppe's hypothesis that Chimaira carried the divine fire in its mouth, and had to be killed before the fire could be brought to man (*Berl. phil. Woch.* XXV. 1905, 387). But this acute hypothesis is too uncertain to clear up the near relationship of Prometheus and Chimaireus. But a personal name as *Αἰγίπυρος* (s. Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der Eigenn.* s.v.) might favour the same view (the name probably is to be referred to the 'fiery' nature of the goat, or to the colour, cp. *Πύριππος* and *Πυρίππη*, Bechtel, *Die histor. Personennamen*, 392).

We have not here to track the intercourse of Boeotia-Phokis and Troas in prehomeric times (cp. Hektor buried by Thebes; Epeios, the son of Panopeus, who made the wooden horse, just as Prometheus in Panopeus made man—and perhaps animals too), nor to follow the ways of the renowned Phlegyans from Orchomenos who founded Panopeus (Chryse was the mother, Chryses the son of Phlegyas, perhaps we may connect this genealogy with the 'gold' that was said once to have been found by the Phoceans on the frontier of Panopeus, *Paus.* IX. 40, 12), and then set fire to the temple of Apollo in Delphi (more friendly relations to the Apollinic religion appear from schol. *Nik. Ther.* 685—the different perception of the Phlegyans may be due to the struggle for the hegemony at Delphi between the neighbours Krisa and Panopeus), v. O. Müller, *Orchomenos*, 134, 141, and Höfer in his article 'Phlegyas' in Roscher's *Myth. Lex.* Phlegyas himself was killed ('in Euboea') by Apollo, or, according to



Apollod. II. 5, 5, by Lykos and Nykteus (in this legend Apollinic heroes, as we may suppose)—heroes especially known to us from the myth of Antiope. Moreover, a Λύκος in stone might be seen on the frontier of Phokis and Lokris, according to Anton Lib. 38, probably an old apotropaic safeguard against enemies, daemonic and human. Further, we hear of Ἀντό-λυκος as the son of the Phoecean princess Philonis and Apollo (or Hermes), schol. *Od.* XIX. 432. Other reminiscences of Lykos in Phokis may be seen in Lyk-oros, Lyk-oreia, on the Parnassus (s. art. 'Lykoros' in Roscher's *Lex.*, and cp. Paus. X. 6, 2 about λύκοι as the guides and saviours from the overhanging inundation), and we may add the very son of Prometheus, Deukalion, if we bear in mind the confusion of the stems λυκ- (λευκός, thence Leukarion, or Deukalion) 'light,' and λυκ- 'wolf.' We find a Λεύκος, alongside with Λύκος, a Λεύκαρος with Λυκάριος (s. Bechtel, *Die histor. Personennamen*, pp. 278 and 290). Although Usener's quite improbable hypothesis of a 'Radikalmetapher' to account for the melting together of the two stems with their many derivations in mythology has not been favoured, as far as I know, by mythologists, yet the fact itself is beyond doubt (Λύκος is opposed to Νυκτεύς, to Χρόνιος, Λύκος is son of Αἴγυπτος, or son of Κελαινώ, etc.).

But the combination and opposition of λύκος and αἶξ or χίμαιρα is also beyond doubt (cp. e.g. *Anth. Pal.* IX. 558, λύκος χιμαίροσφκτήρ). We know from Thebes and Sparta Αἰγέως as the son of Οἶό-λυκος (son of Theras), Paus. IV. 7, 8; the Οἶο-λύκη as the daughter of Αἰγαίων (cp. a shortly forthcoming article in the Swedish *Erano*s by the author of these lines); finally, Λύκος as the brother and antagonist of Αἰγέως in Attica (Suid. s. τὸ τοῦ Αἰγέως μαντεύειν hints to his nature as a mantic daemon). Perhaps we may add Αἰγαίων as the son of Λυκάων (Apollod. III. 8, 1) and an Αἶγίος as the son of Αἴγυπτος (Apollod. II. 1, 5)—Aigyptos, 'the dark one,' is himself the son of Λευκ-ίππη, according to *Plut. de fluu.* 16.

Wolf and goat are both animals of Apollo (s. Wernicke in the *Realencyklopädie* II. col. III, Farnell, *Cults*, IV.

254 f.). The supposition of Wide, *Lak. Kulte* 89, that the family of the Aigeidai was especially interested in the cultus of Apollon Amyklaios and his goat, may be correct. A personal name as Λύκων Πυθία from Byzantium (*J.G.* XII. 5, 540) or Λυκῖνος as the son of Archandros on Naxos may be referred to the same cultural connexion (Apollo himself was on Naxos named Τράγιος). In the second oracle of Phlegon, mir. c. 10, l. 47, a white goat is sacrificed to Apollo, and Diels in his *Sibyll. Blätter* 51, compares Liv. XXV. 12 (the sacrifice of two white goats at the Apollinarian games).

Now when we turn to Rome and Italy, we find that the obscure cult of *Vediovis* and the performances of the *hirpi Sorani* bear some resemblance to the cult of Apollon Lykios and Phyxios and an Apollon Tragios. The cult-statue of Vediovis looked like an Apollo (Wissowa, *Religion u. Cultus der Röm.*,<sup>2</sup> 237, A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, I. 712), the site of his first temple on the Tiber isle, his arrows and his goat may all be referred to his character as a god that can heal and evoke pestilence. The 'wolves of Soracte' with their jumping over burning wood perform cathartic rites, which likewise tend to avert pestilence (Frazer, *Golden Bough*,<sup>2</sup> III. 311; W. W. Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, 84, the material was completely collected by Mannhardt, *A. W. u. F.* 318 ff.). No doubt the legend told by *Serv. Aen.* XI. 785, about the wolves that seize upon the flesh on the flaming altar and run away with it to the cavern which exhales the deadly putrid smell, will just explain the running of the 'wolves' (*hirpi*) over the flaming fuel as the proper way to get rid of menacing pestilence. Finally, the *creppi* of the Lupercalia, the feast for 'keeping the wolves off,' may be mentioned in this connexion.

The goats and the wolves, in Italy as well as in Greece, clearly provoked similar superstitions, and for the Vediovis in Rome the affiliation to Greek cults (e.g. to an Apollo in Cumae who had the same religious character as the Callimachean Lykios and Phyxios) may still be open for discussion.

S. EITREM.

Kristiana.

## A NUMISMATIC NOTE ON THE LELANTIAN WAR.

THAT the war between Chalcis and Eretria in Euboea for the possession of the rich Lelantian plain was an outstanding event in early Greek history is proved by the mention of it in Thucydides.<sup>1</sup> He says that as a rule the wars in Greece in early times (*πάλαι*) were mere quarrels between neighbours; but on the occasion of the Lelantian war, other Greek cities joined each of the parties as allies (*συνμάχοι*). Herodotus tells us that the people of Samos sided with Chalcis, and those of Miletus with Eretria. Plutarch<sup>2</sup> informs us that Thessalian knights, under the leadership of Cleomachus, came to the help of the Chalcidians, and determined the battle in their favour.

We are, of course, obliged to take the statement of Thucydides seriously; but I think that some of the modern historians of Greece have built too much on his phrase. Duncker speaks of the war as a long and stubborn one; Beloch<sup>3</sup> takes the same view. Holm<sup>4</sup> extends the field of conflict to Italy, and supposes that the people of Sybaris took part with Eretria, and the people of Croton with Chalcis. Other writers have gone further still, and supposed that the war broke up Greece into two hostile camps.

All this is exaggeration. The evidence does not seem to point to a continued war. That a party of Thessalian knights should have joined in on the side of Chalcis is not unnatural; they were probably connected in some way with the Hippobotae, the aristocratic rulers of the city. As to the aid brought by Miletus to the Eretrians, and by Samos and the Euboic cities of Chalcidice in Thrace to Chalcis, we have no particulars. It can scarcely have been on a large scale, and whatever it was it consisted only of land-troops: there is no mention whatever of a war by sea. We hear only of one battle, decided in favour of the people of Chalcis by the valour of the Thessalian Cleomachus,

and the result of that battle appears to have been the lasting possession by the Chalcidians of the territory in dispute, until the Athenians deprived them of it shortly before the Persian wars.

Nor is Holm's suggestion that the Crotoniates took the part of Chalcis and the Sybarites that of Eretria happy. It is true that Sybaris was conquered and destroyed by Croton about 510 B.C. But the cities had before been on good terms. We even have coins, dating from about the middle of the sixth century, which record a monetary union of the two cities, the name and type of Croton appearing on the obverse and those of Sybaris on the reverse. After 510 there are no coins of Sybaris.

There is practically no external evidence to fix the date of the Lelantian war. Duncker argues, from the use of the word *πάλαι* by Thucydides, that he supposed it to have taken place in the seventh century: Beloch, though he allows that the evidence is quite inconclusive, inclines to 600-570 B.C.<sup>5</sup> A passage of Theognis<sup>6</sup> has been cited as showing that the poet of Megara was a contemporary of the war. But that passage does not bear such an inference. Theognis laments the destruction of Cerinthus and the ravaging of the Lelantian plain, and if a doubtful reading be accepted, in some way blames the Cypselidae of Corinth for it. But there is no ground at all for connecting this destruction with a war between Chalcis and Eretria. Another view connects the building of four triremes by the Corinthian Ameinocles about 700 B.C. for the Samians with the same conflict; but as the war was fought by land and not by sea, there is no point in this.

Strabo says<sup>7</sup> that the cities of Euboea generally lived in harmony, but that Chalcis and Eretria quarrelled about the Lelantian plain. The evidence seems entirely to confirm this statement. In the days when Chalcis and

<sup>1</sup> I. 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Amator*, p. 760.

<sup>3</sup> I. 1, p. 339.

<sup>4</sup> Papers on the occasion of the seventieth year of E. Curtius.

<sup>5</sup> I. 1, p. 339.

<sup>6</sup> II. 891-4; cf. E. Harrison, *Studies in Theognis*, p. 292.

<sup>7</sup> X. p. 448.

Eretria founded colonies in Thrace in Italy and in Sicily, they appear to have worked in harmony, Chalcis taking the lead, and smaller towns, such as Cyme in Euboea, falling into line. From the time of the introduction of coinage, late in the seventh century, to the time of the Persian wars, they had a uniform though not identical coinage.

It is curious that it did not occur to Holm, who was an accomplished numismatist, to consider the question in relation to the coinages of the cities concerned, the testimony of which is important. Late in the seventh, and early in the sixth, century the cities of Euboea and their neighbours issued coins; and we might fairly expect that if the Lelantian War had been a long and important one it would have left traces on the coinages of the cities involved, as did the Ionian revolt and the confederacy of the Greek cities of South Italy in the sixth century. No such traces are to be found. The indications are all in another direction.

About 600 B.C. the monetary conditions of central Greece were very clearly marked out. Aegina had a monetary standard of her own which spread over the islands of the Aegean to Chios and Rhodes and some cities of the Asiatic mainland, such as Teos and Cnidus. Corinth had a system of her own, the influence of which spread to her colonies in the west and north. The third system was that of a group of cities, the cities of Euboea, Athens, and perhaps Megara. These towns struck uniformly didrachms of about 130 grains (gr. 8.42), bearing

on one side the type belonging to the city which issued them, on the other side an incuse square. From this uniform coinage Athens broke away in the time of Pisistratus;<sup>1</sup> but the cities of Euboea seem to have continued it down to the Persian wars. It is most improbable that Chalcis and Eretria would have adhered to this uniform coinage if there had been a standing feud between them.

A fact mentioned by Strabo suggests the real character of the war. He observes<sup>2</sup> that the two cities made an agreement, which they inscribed on a slab set up in the temple of Artemis Amarynthia, to use no missile weapons, but only swords and spears. Such an agreement was unique, so far as I know, in ancient history; and it is very suggestive. Probably the war was undertaken as the only way of settling the dispute as to the possession of the plain. A near parallel would be the contest between three hundred Spartans and three hundred Argives for the possession of the Thyreatis. It was a kind of fighting-match or ordeal by combat; and did not permanently embitter the relations between the two cities. It was a knightly combat which taught the cities to respect one another, but left little rancour. The Chalcidians were noted for their knightly character.

P. GARDNER.

<sup>1</sup> For proofs of these assertions I must refer the reader to my *History of Ancient Coinage*.

<sup>2</sup> X. p. 448.

#### TICIDAS THE NEOTERIC POET.

In the interesting group of new poets there was one Ticidas who wrote lines to Metella disguised under the name of Perilla (Apul. *Apol.* 10; Ovid, *Trist.* II. 433-7), composed at least one Epithalamium (Prisc. *Gram.* II. p. 189) and paid his respects in verse to Valerius Cato (Suet. *de Gram.* 11). Some slight indication of his date may be drawn from a sentence of a letter of Messalla's quoted by Suetonius: 'non esse sibi

rem cum Furio Bibaculo, ne cum Ticida quidem aut litteratore Catone.' Presumably he belonged to the period of Virgil's and Messalla's youth when the influence of Catullus and Valerius Cato was still strong.

The name is otherwise unknown, though a Roman knight of the name of Ticida is mentioned in Caesar, *Bell. Afr.* 45. A freedman he could hardly have been, despite the name, for it is

not conceivable that a man of low station could have paid suit to a Metella. Doubtless he was a Roman of some position who wrote under a pseudonym. Ovid suggests as much when he says

Quid referam Ticidae, quid Memmi carmen,  
apud quos  
Rebus adest nomen, nominibusque pudor?

One may well suppose that the name of the writer, as well as of the recipient, needed in this case to be concealed, since the reputation of a distinguished woman was involved. The circumstances were obviously quite different from those in which Tibullus, Gallus, and Propertius wrote.

The methods of concealing names were many. Delia is a translation of Plania, Cynthia is apparently but a metrical equivalent of Hostia, Lycoris seems to be derived from Cytheris by legendary association, Lesbia from Clodia by a literary suggestion. Tidas derives Perilla from Metella by a simple word-play in Greek *μετά~περί*. It is not unlikely that the word Tidas is formed in the same way. The suffix is doubtless the Sicilian Doric form of the patronymic ending as in Lycidas. The rest of the word seems to be a colloquial form of *τύχη*, since Latin inscriptions not infrequently give *Tice*<sup>1</sup> for the very common Tyche. If this be the formation of the word, then Tidas is very probably none other than Clodius Aesopus, the spendthrift son of the actor Aesopus, already known to us from several anecdotes as the lover of Metella, the wife of Lentulus Spinther. The word-play is simple: *τύχη* = *αἷσα* (Aesopus — *αἰσῶπις* = 'the lucky eye'), so that *Tidas* is intended to be the equivalent of 'filius Aesopi' (Hor. *Serm.* II. 3. 239; Cic. *Ad Att.* XI. 153). The semantic equivalence of the names and the appearance of a Metella as the object of devotion in both instances would seem to warrant the identification proposed.

This son of Aesopus has hitherto been known mainly from stories of his extravagance in connexion with Metella.

Horace's lines, *Serm.* II. 3. 238 ff., are well known,

filius Aesopi detractam ex aure Metellae,  
scilicet ut deciens solidum absorberet aceto  
diluuit insignem bacam.

From his father, the foremost actor in Rome, he had inherited twenty million sesterces and proceeded to waste it with ostentatious lavishness (Macr. *Sat.* III. 14. 14; Val. Mac. IX. 1. 2; Pliny, *N. H.* IX. 122; XXXV. 163). Cicero in the year 46 was grieved to hear that his son-in-law Dolabella was being led astray by the young prodigal, in company with Metella (*Ad Att.* XI. 15. 3, and 23. 3), and two years later reports that Metella's husband, Lentulus, had secured a divorce from his faithless wife (*Ad Att.* XII. 52. 2; XIII. 7. 1). We may, then, assume that the verses of Tidas were written during the last years of Caesar's rule. Porphyrio, who to be sure is frequently inaccurate, in commenting on Horace's lines calls Metella the *uxor* of Aesopus. It may seem pedantic but not wholly unsound literary criticism to suggest that the marriage may be taken as the date *ante quem* of the verses in question.

We may add that there seems to be no good reason for assuming that the famous actor Aesopus was once a slave. Had he been a freedman the fastidious Cicero would hardly have spoken of him in such terms of high respect as he frequently did. Possibly he had been brought to Rome as a captive in war, but it is far more likely that he had been a free citizen of some south Italian Greek town which gained municipal rights in 89, or that he had as a free Greek secured his Roman citizenship through the favour of some Claudius. In that case it is readily understood how his son could associate with such Romans as Dolabella and Metella.

Finally, let me make what may seem a meteoric conjecture that the voluminously discussed *simius iste* (Valerius Cato's ape, cf. Hendrickson, *Class. Phil.* 1919, p. 334) of Horace, *Serm.* I. 10. 18, may be this very Tidas-Aesopus. I make the suggestion because Messalla connected the names of Valerius Cato and Tidas so closely in the passage quoted by Suetonius: 'non esse sibi

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *C.I.L.* 8, 3158; 10, 8249; 7816; 12, 5699<sup>20</sup>.



rem cum Furio Bibaculo, ne cum T적이다 quidem aut litteratore Catone.' Professor Hendrickson has already suggested that this quotation of Messalla's seems to be taken from a letter intimately connected with Horace's *Serm.*

I. 10. Perhaps some reader may be able to forge the missing link of the incomplete argument.

TENNEY FRANK.

*Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, U.S.A.*

### SOME READINGS IN ACHILLES TATIUS.

I. 2. 3. πάντως δὲ ὁ τοιοῦτος τόπος ἡδὺς καὶ μύθων ἄξιος ἐρωτικῶν.

Should we not read ὅτι οὗτος ὁ τόπος?

I. 4. 3. τοιαύτην εἶδον . . . ἐπὶ ταύρῳ γεγραμμένην Σελήνην.

Europa is referred to. Is not the original Σιδωνίαν (a Sidonian girl)?

I. 15. 5. τὰ δὲ ἄνθη ποικίλῃν ἔχοντα τὴν χροίαν ἐν μέρει συνεξέφαινε τὸ κάλλος, καὶ ἦν τοῦτο τῆς γῆς πορφύρα καὶ νάρκισσος καὶ ῥόδον· μία μὲν τῷ ῥόδῳ καὶ τῷ ναρκίσσῳ ἡ κάλυξ, ὅσον εἰς περιγραφὴν· καὶ ἦν φιάλη τοῦ φυτοῦ. ἡ χροιά δὲ τῶν περὶ τὴν κάλυκα φύλλων ἐσχισμένων, τῷ ῥόδῳ μὲν αἵματος ὄμων ἔων καὶ γάλακτος τὸ κάτω τοῦ φύλλου.

For ἦν τοῦτο we should read ἐν ταύτῳ = 'on the same spot of earth. In § 6 the violet is described. Hence we should read πορφύρα ἴα καὶ ν., the error having arisen from haplography. § 4 has καὶ ἦν βόστρυχος τοῦ φυτοῦ, of which ἦν φιάλη is an echo. We should read as a parenthesis (καὶ ἀμφιλάφει τῷ φυτῷ) 'these two are big flowers,' the opposite of the violet, whose leaves were οὐδαμοῦ (§ 6). The next words seem to contrast the edges of the rose-leaves with the bottom of the same. May we read αἵματος ἄνωθεν, καὶ κτλ.?

2. 2. 2. διηγούνται μῦθον, οἶνον οὐκ εἶναι πω παρ' ἀνθρώποις, οὐπω παρ' αὐτοῖς (GH ὅπου μῆπω παρ' αὐτοῖς) οὐ τὸν μέλανα κτλ.

GH is 'a better text,' as Mr. Gaselee says. Is it not likely that underlying it is the reading οὐ φῦναι πω παρ' αὐτοῖς? The repetition is effective (ο = ου, μ = ν as often).

2. 4. 2. τὸ αὐτόματον ἡμῶν προϋνοή-σεν ἡ τύχη.

ἡ τύχη = 'how things are to turn out' would make good sense.

2. 10. 3. προσεῖμι θρασύτερος γενο-μενος πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης προσ-βολῆς, ὥσπερ στρατιώτης ἥδη νενικηκώς.

Is not πρὸς ἦταν the true reading = 'in respect of being defeated'? α and η may have changed places; υ and τ are very similar in uncials.

5. 22. 3. Ποῖον ἄνδρα; οὐδὲν κοινόν ἐστιν ἢ τοῖς λίθοις.

We should read κοινόν στηλίταις λίθοις, especially as ἀλλά με παρενδο-κιμεί τις νεκρά follows. ε = σ, σ = τ, ι = η, ν = λ as often.

5. 25. 8. εὐνοῦχε καὶ ἀνδρόγυνε καὶ κάλλους καλοῦ βάσκανε.

Should we not read κήλη β. = 'ruptured beauty'?

6. 9. 3. φέρε πάντα τιμῶμεν αὐτοῦ τὰ νανάγια.

ναύτου would make good sense.

6. 19. 4. φύσει τε ὦν ἄσπονδος. γε, causal, would be idiomatic.

6. 22. 1. καὶ ἡ Λευκίπη εἶπεν 'Εἰ παρθένος καὶ μετὰ Σωσθένην'.

ἦ, a strong asseveration, would suit her passionate claim to purity.

7. 3. 1. ἐποιοῦμην δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Σμύρνης ὁδόν.

ἐφερόμην is possible, ι often resembling ρ.

7. 3. 7. παραδίδωσι τῷ νῦν ἔφη κακῇ τύχῃ μοι συνωδευκότι.

ἐπὶ κ.τ. is the original.

7. 9. 13. ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ οἶδα, μαθεῖν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἐξέσται.

οἶμαι is the original, σ being misread for ι.

7. 10. 3. λάθρα τινὰ τῶν προστατῶν . . . ἀποστέλλει.

Ι.ε. προπετῶν, στ having supplanted π as often.

7. 13. 1. This passage should be read as follows: ὡς δὲ ἦν οὐδαμοῦ, θάρσος αὐτῇ καὶ ἐλπίς ἡ συνήθης εἰσέρχεται (μνήμη γὰρ αὐτῇ τοῦ πολλάκις παρὰ δόξαν σεσῶσθαι πρὸς τὸ πάρον τῶν κινδύνων τὴν ἐλπίδα προὔξεναι) ἀποχρησθαι τῇ τύχῃ.

## PARTHENIUS.

V. περὶ Λευκίππου. § 2 τῆς δὲ παραχρῆμα τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν φάμενης τελευτεῖν ῥάων ἤδη γέγονεν.

I.e. τελεώσειν, τ being misread as σ.

§ 5 Θετταλοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν . . . ἡγήσατο.

ἱππόταις is the original.

IX. περὶ Πολυκρίτης. § 8 τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ οἱ Νάξιοι πάντες πολὺν πόθον εἶχον βιάσασθαι τὴν κόρην· καὶ οἱ μὲν τινες αὐτὴν μίτραις ἀνέδουν, οἱ δὲ ζωναῖς κτλ.

ἐπιέσασθαι must be the true reading, the Middle expressing the action of a whole people.

XIII. περὶ Ἀρπαλύκης. § 3 . . . θυσίας . . . ἐν ᾗ δημοσίᾳ πάντες εὐωχοῦνται καὶ τότε σκευάσασα τὰ κρέα . . . παρατιθῇσι . . .

Should we not read ἐκάστοτε, σκ.?

XIV. περὶ Ἀνθέως. § 5 καὶ ἐκαθαψαμένη γούνων ἀτέλεστα κομίσσαι πείσει (ll. 13-14).

I.e. ἃ τ' ἄλαστα, τ' idiomatic in a relative sentence.

XV. περὶ Δάφνης. παρεσκευασμένη δὲ πύκνας ἐθήρευν.

I.e. λύγκας. π and λ are often confused.

XXII. περὶ Ναλίδος. μὴ ἀθροισθὲν τὸ συμμαχικὸν αὐτῆς τῷ Κροίσῳ κτλ.

I.e. Λυδίας, 'from Lydia'; α = λ.

T. W. LUMB.

HORACE, *Odes* I. 34, 7.

namque Diespiter  
igni corusco nubila dividens  
plerumque per purum tonantis  
egit equos volucremque currum.

When the ordinary Roman citizen bought a copy of Horace's *Odes* and carried it home to read, how far was his understanding helped by any system of punctuation supplied by the author or the publisher? I have no first-hand acquaintance with Latin manuscripts, but I infer that the commas, which spring so plentifully in the path of the modern reader, were unknown to Horace's contemporaries. Let anyone read through the *Odes*, 'thinking away' the commas, and he will find that they were after all unnecessary for the understanding of the text, except in one line. Everywhere else he has two unfailing guides—the syntactical construction and the rhythm of the metre.

The solitary exception is the passage I have quoted. How was our Roman to know that *plerumque* qualified *dividens*? Now the earlier editors of Horace, reasonably enough, took *plerumque* with the succeeding words, and, less reasonably, tried to explain it as equivalent to *saepe*, a use established for Silver Latin. Bentley fancied that he was the first to

put a comma after *plerumque*, but found that he had been anticipated by one Thomas Bangius, *cuius*, as he remarks rather testily, *ne nomen quidem antea audiveram*.

If Horace had any commas at his disposal, no doubt he put one after *plerumque*. Thomas Bangius shall have the credit for his sagacity, and the case is closed. But if Horace had no comma or its equivalent, there are two objections to inserting one. (1) The metre is dead against it. (2) The position of *plerumque* requires some explanation. Bentley seems to have felt this, and quotes *Epist.* II. 2, 84:

statua taciturnius exit  
plerumque et risu populum quatit;

and *Lucr.* 5, 1131:

invidia quoniam ceu fulmine summa vaporant  
plerumque et quae sint aliis magis edita cumque

These passages are hardly in point, because in each *plerumque* clearly qualifies the second, as well as the first, clause. (He might have added *Hor. A.P.* 14: *inceptis gravibus plerumque et magna professis*.) When a word in Latin is intended to qualify two groups of words, its most effective position is at

the end of the first group. Outside Lucretius, *plerumque* is rare in Latin poetry, and I have yet to find a clear example of it placed last in its clause.

It may be said in justification that at Rome poetry was disseminated rather by the ear than by the eye; the pause after, instead of before, *plerumque* may have been established by the author's own manner of recitation. Horace at any rate rarely gave his readers that advantage: *non recito cuiquam nisi amicis idque coactus*.

Or again, it may be argued that common sense would prevent anyone from taking *plerumque* with *egit* rather than with *dividens*. But has any author a right to go out of his way to create even a possible misunderstanding? Why could not Horace have written

*plerumque nubes fulmine dividens?*

He puts *plerumque* exactly in the right place in the only other passage in the *Odes* where he uses it, III. 21, 14:

*tu lene tormentum ingenio admoves  
plerumque duro.*

Of all writers Horace is the least likely to put the right word in the wrong place.

My object is not to propose emendation, but to raise the wider question of punctuation as it affects textual criticism. Ought we not to be perfectly clear about the extent and limits of classical punctuation before we emend Latin texts? Will some competent scholar boldly print this ode exactly as he supposes it to have appeared when it dangled from the Sosii's doorpost?

I turn to Professor Housman, and I find that he would print in *Sat. I. 3, 103*:

*donec verba, quibus sensus, vocesque, notarent,  
nominaque invenere.*

This is very ingenious; but could Horace have written or even recited it so? I turn to Professor Postgate, and I find him inserting a comma in Catullus 6, 7:

*nam te non viduas iacere noctes,  
nequiquam tacitum, cubile clamat.*

Perhaps this is what Catullus meant, but is it what his readers understood him to mean?

Let me give an illustration. Mrs. Leo Hunter's Ode, as every scholar knows, is preserved in a single carelessly written manuscript *V* (*Cod. Vorobibiensis*, now in the Municipal Library of Eatanswill). The first two lines appear thus in all the early editions:

*Can I view thee panting, lying  
On thy stomach without sighing?*

Satisfactory as this may appear to the ordinary reader, it affords an opportunity to a Bentley or a Bangius. He deftly inserts a comma after 'stomach,' a *palmaria emendatio* indeed! It is a real restoration of the text, because that comma was, or ought to have been, part of the equipment of the gifted authoress for the exact expression of her meaning. But is it possible to restore the text of Horace or Catullus in the same way by inserting a comma?

As Rosa Dartle would say: 'Is it really, though? I want to know.'

J. H. VINCE.

#### SOME PASSAGES FROM THE *METAMORPHOSIS* OF OVID.

*Met. VIII. 117:*

*nam quo deserta revertar?  
in patriam? superata iacet. sed finge  
manere:  
proditione mea clausa est mihi. patris ad  
ora,  
quem tibi donavi? cives odere merentem,  
117 finitimi exemplum metuunt, exponimur  
orbe  
terrarum, nobis ut Crete sola pateret.*

117 sic M et unus Heinsii. exponimus orbem N, Paris 8001, Spirensis.

*obstruximus orbem . . . nobis: (cf. 185 sq. infra) cum dett Naugerius. orbi coniecit Heinsius.*

In this passage, once it is agreed that we should, as Heinsius urged, adopt 'exponimur,' the reading of the best MS., M, much—if not everything—will depend upon a correct punctuation. Now M places a stop after 'terrarum' in line 118, showing that here (as at *Lucr. 5. 1166 f.*) the expression 'orbis—

terrarium,' though divided between two lines, is clearly to be regarded as a single word.<sup>1</sup>

Heinsius in his manuscript collation of M duly noted the stop: so did Merkel in the text of his second edition. Dr. Magnus, the most recent editor, does not. He either ignores or overlooks the evidence and, following a modification of Bentley by P. von Winterfeld, is led to print 'exponimur orbae, terrarum nobis,' etc., i.e. . . . 'marooned' (? or 'exposed,' 'modus loquendi sumptus ab infantibus,' Heinsius: cf. ad 9. 779 [780] Schepper), 'forlorn, for Crete alone of lands to shelter.' The true reading and interpretation seem to hinge on a slight transposition, for which we must turn to two other witnesses, one of them beyond question a 'testis locupletissimus,' viz. Kings 26 (saec. xi.), the British Museum MS., which Mr. Housman unearthed. In that, and in a much later MS. (anni 1472), copied from a good original, No. 1045 in the Arsenal Library in Paris, the order of the second and third words in the line is reversed.<sup>2</sup> Adopt that change with the reading and the punctuation of M and you come, with the change of a single letter, either to the truth itself or, at least, next door to the truth:

cives odere merentem  
finitimi metuunt, exemplum exponimur orbi  
terrarium, nobis ut Crete sola pateret.

Scylla dwells upon the widening circle of her own infamy, in order to emphasize the heartlessness of Minos. 'My fellow-citizens hate me, the neighbouring peoples fear me, yes, and I let myself be proverbial for a warning to the whole world, all in the hope that

Crete would be vouchsafed to me.' There seems to be an authentic echo of the true verse and view in S. Augustine's famous prose-phrase:

'securus iudicat orbis  
Terrarum.'

For the syntax see Catullus 101. 3 and *Aeneid* 6. 534, with Dr. Reid's note on Cicero, *Pro Sulla*, § 57, and for 'exemplum' in the sense of 'a warning,' if the use needs illustration, compare *Met.* IX. 455, 'Byblis in exemplo est, ut ament concessa puellae'; Plautus, *Rudens* 620; Prop. 4. 1. 109. Heinsius *ad loc.* exemplifies the meaning of 'exponere.' Add Cicero, *Phil.* 2. 114, which links the two words 'exemplum' and 'exponere' together, though in a different sense, in one context.

I said above 'next door to the truth': for is 'exponimur' a 'freak' word, representing an original text 'expo ponimur'?<sup>3</sup> Capelli gives 'EXP' as a recognised abbreviation in early MSS. for 'exemplum,' and in that case we can account at once for the corruption (the abbreviation tacked on by haplography to 'ponimur' and the 'expansion' interpolated in the wrong case at the wrong place in the line), but Professor Lindsay<sup>4</sup> traverses Capelli's assertion, and I mention this view therefore with all due reserve. It is a luxury, not a necessity.

Last, it should be observed that Dr. Magnus makes some atonement for overlooking the point in M by giving publicity in his note to a conjecture which deserves attention, viz. Santen's '. . . Crete nobis ut sola pateret'—an order of words which would certainly round off well the rhetoric of a highly rhetorical passage.

#### *Met.* VIII. 411-413:

misit et Aesonides iaculum, quod casus ab illo  
vertit in inmeriti casum flarantibus et inter  
ilia coniectum tellure per ilia fixum est.

How little Heinsius believed in the assumption that in a context like this 'latrans' is legitimate or acceptable Latin for a hound is shown by the fact that after adopting the above reading

<sup>1</sup> This device is more frequent in the Horatian than in the Ovidian Hexameter. Cf. Hor. *S.* i. 2. 62; 9. 51; ii. 3. 117 and 179; *Ep.* ii. 2. 93 and 188; *A.P.* 290 and 424. Here it seems to me to help most effectively the ascending scale: 'cives—finitimi—orbis!' The 'overflow' is in every sense of the word momentous. It is akin to the fine 'hypermeters' in Horace, *C.* 2. 3. 27; 3. 29. 35 f., and Vergil, *Aen.* 4. 625. With the authority of the best MS. behind it, is not to be gainsaid.

<sup>2</sup> Elisions of the type 'finitimi exemplum' are rare in the *Met.*—1 in 1000 lines about—a minor point in a difficult problem, but nevertheless worth weighing.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Prop. 2. 3. 42, 'Hic dominam exemplo ponat in arte meam.'

<sup>4</sup> *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge, 1915), p. 426.



from the 'Cantabrigiensis' as a *pis aller* in the text he proceeds to argue in his note that a proper name is required and tries to supply the need by conjecturing Celadontis. Hounds have been mentioned a few lines above (332, 343 f.), but not by name; and why it should be thought that a dog's name is concealed, it is not easy to apprehend. No Argus or Gelert had earned an immortality in the Annals of the Caledonian Hunt. But we know, or should know, from the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus, that before the boar was killed one of the hunters was accidentally shot. This is how Apollodorus presents the facts: περιστάτων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν κάπρον Τλεὺς μὲν καὶ Ἀγκαῖος (cf. *supra* 391-402) ὑπὸ τοῦ θηρὸς διεφθάρησαν, Εὐρυτιῶνα δὲ Πηλεὺς ἄκων κατηκόντισε (*Bibl.* i. 8. 2. 6). Elsewhere (iii. 13. 2) he refers again to the incident thus: ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν τοῦ Καλυδωνίου κάπρου μετ' Εὐρυτιῶνος ἐλθὼν (Πηλεὺς), προιεμένος ἐπὶ τὸν σὺν ἀκόντιον Εὐρυτιῶνος τυγχάνει καὶ κτείνει τοῦτον ἄκων. As Ovid appears to be drawing on Apollodorus for the essentials of the story,<sup>1</sup> I take it we should restore 'Eurytionis' for 'Iatrantis,' almost without a moment's hesitation. The variant 'in mentum' for 'inneriti' may point to 'intenti' (cf. 311 *supra*, *inpiger* Eurytion), but that is a detail which need not be pressed. The name 'Eurytion' puzzled the scribes when it occurred before. There, however, they gave us something that was not—like the traces here where the *vetus lectio* in MN is erased beyond recovery—altogether unrecognisable, without the help of external evidence. But if 'Eurytionis' is right, then 'Aesonides' in the line before is wrong. Ovid<sup>2</sup> knew the story too well to make such a blunder; but his scribes did not. Jason has already (349 *supra*) shot his bolt and played his part. The 'et' ('misit et Aesonides') suggests a fresh

participant. On these grounds Tan. Faber conjectured Oeclides, a suggestion which Burmann seems only to condemn in order to offer an emendation of his own. The remedy is to be found in a slighter change. Read Aeacides and the wound is healed.

misit et Aeacides iaculum, quod casus ab illo  
vertit in inmeriti fatum Eurytionis, et inter  
ilia coniectum tellure per ilia fixum est.

At *Met.* XI. 714 read:

mane erat: egreditur tectis ad litus et illum  
maesta locum repetit, de quo spectarat  
euntem.

dumque moratur ibi, dumque 'Hic retinacula  
solvit,  
'hoc mihi discedens dedit oscula litore,'  
dicit,

714 quae cunctata loqui est, reminiscitur acta,  
fretumque  
prospicit.

714. quae dum tota locis M (locis et  
*Spirensis*); dumque notata oculis *cett.*  
*fere*, Naugierius, Madvig (*cl. Quint.* II.  
2. 17), *edd.*

It is strange that this passage has not been emended before. The context cries out for a sharper antithesis between the words and the thoughts of Alcyone (else why the stress on 'dicit?'), and though both readings are manifestly corrupt, yet they help one another out in a most accommodating spirit. In other passages of the poem the text has been vitiated by loss of the first word in a line. For one striking instance—viz. 9. 415—see *C.R.* 29. 58b. Less controversial and more 'luciferous' is 10. 68. There we can watch the genesis of the corruption—'quam qui in se recte M; qui (que *man. al. s.s.* quam) in se *Urbinas* 341: qui (que *s.l. man. sec.*) in se *Pal. Vat.* 1669 [*omisso τῷ quam, interpolatum est—vide ad 9. 718; 10. 264; alibi—τὸ -que, ne claudat versus:*] quique in se N, *Paris* 8001, *cett. fere.*'

Here M alone has preserved the 'quae'; while *per contra* 'notata (= nctata)'<sup>3</sup>—a relique of 'cunctata,' the key-word and stumbling-block—comes from the *deteriores*. 'Loqui' is corrupted into 'oculis' at 5. 678, and, as 'locor' for

<sup>1</sup> Compare with the corrupt line (317a) in M 'venit Athalantis cenei pulcherrima virgo' the words of Apollodorus *loc. cit.* Ἀταλάντη Σχοινέως ἐξ Ἀρκαδίας, from which one might conceivably conjecture that the line should run Schoenēis || Atalanta venit, etc.; cf. *Am.* i. 7. 13.

<sup>2</sup> See Book XI.

<sup>3</sup> *o=c.* So the scribe of Harley MS. 2610 gives Ovid's name on his first page as P. C. Naso.

'loquor' occurs in  $\pi^1$  at 2. 142 and in *Pal. Vat.* 1669 at 14. 172, the 'loqui est' may at one stage of transmission have been written 'locist,' from which it is but a step to 'locis.'

Very fascinating, but far more difficult and dubious, is the problem of VII. 115 f.:

115 deriguere metu Minyae: subit ille nec  
ignes  
sensit anhelatos (tantum medicamina pos-  
sunt)  
pendulaque audaci mulcet palearia dextra  
suppositosque iugo pondus grave cogit  
aratri  
ducere *e.g.s.*

*sic fere edd.* 115. Min. subit ille, *Fragm. Voss. deperditum et 'veteres'* Naugerii. subito Min. ille, *codices qui extant omnes, nisi quod subito om. Marcianus 223 man. pr., addidit man. al.* nec ignes Naugerius, *cll. Her. 12. 15. nec illos, codd. fere. nec ullos, Paris 8001 et Spirensis.*

116. anhelatos M<sup>1</sup>N. an(h)elatus, *Paris 8001, Spirensis, Urbina 341, man. al. item pro div. lect. M<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>.* Here Naugerius may be right, but 'subito' is 'Ovidianissimum,' and 'subit ille' tame by comparison, after 'obvius it' just above: while for the words 'nec—anelatos' Planudes has the remarkable variant οὐτε τοῦ τῶν ταύρων ἄσθματος<sup>1</sup> ἤσθετο. Now at 15. 230 for the true text 'tororum,' 'ferorum' is read in all good MSS. but one, and that one has 'ferorum s.s. taurorum.' Is not

that just what Planudes is translating here?

deriguere metu subito Minyae; ille *taurorum ferorum*  
nec sensit flatus *e.g.s.*

The initial 'nec' (line 116) was misplaced, and 'flatus,' corrupted into 'elatus' (the same confusion occurs in the MSS. of Suetonius),<sup>2</sup> was 'padded out' into 'anhelatus,' to scan the line, possibly from the parallel passage in the *Heroides* on which Naugerius founded his conjecture. The elision (see above) is against the proposal, but *cf.* 8. 97; 2. 475; 7. 338; 10. 623; and 6. 596—all five are similar, and the two last very similar, to the instance before us.

One passage more. At II. 154 there is good MS. evidence for a similar disturbance in the opening of the verse; for the words 'solis equi,' which may certainly be said 'glossatorem sapere' (*cf.* 162 *infra*), are from a later hand in  $\pi$  = Parisinus 12246, the noble fragment which Ellis discovered, and in  $\epsilon$  = Harley MS. 2610 they are read *contra metrum* after Phlegon. It is not unreasonable therefore to infer that the two words were not in the text of the source from which  $\epsilon\pi$  derive,<sup>3</sup> and Dr. Henry Bradley makes the attractive suggestion that we should read in their stead 'auricomus,' an epithet of Aethon in the line before.

D. A. SLATER.

<sup>2</sup> *Nero 37.* The letters *e* and *f* are repeatedly confused in the *Met.*

<sup>3</sup> *Cf.* Housman on Juvenal 8. 7, and for a similar interpolation in Sophocles, *Ajax* 771, where the expression  $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  'Αδάρης repeated from 757 would seem to have ousted the true text.

<sup>1</sup> *Cf.* 29 *adflabitur*; 104 *efflant*. At 8, 289 Planudes renders 'adflatu' by the same word, ἄσθματι.

## NOTES

### THE MEANING OF ΑΦΑΤΕΙΝ IN A SPARTAN INSCRIPTION.

THE inscription is one of three discussed on pages 19 and 20 of the *Catalogue of the Sparta Museum* by M. N. Tod and A. J. B. Wace. The inscriptions are assigned to the first century B.C. on page 18, whereas on pages 118 and 158 the reliefs over the inscriptions are ascribed to the second century B.C.

The reliefs represent the Dioscuri at right and left of a female figure in a long robe, which represents their sister Helen. The inscriptions give the names of persons who took part in the feast connected with the sacrifice in honour of the Dioscuri and Helen. I summarise here the account of the inscriptions given on pages 18 to 20 of the *Sparta Museum Catalogue*. Five of the names of the list are those of the family

in whom is vested the hereditary priesthood of the Dioscuri; five others are officers of the guild. A third group follows, of the higher grade of functionaries, religious and artistic, attached to the guild, such as herald, prophet, lyre-player. Fourth, there is a group of eleven men and one woman, of whom two are slaves, while six others are freemen. These occupy the lowest position, or are craftsmen whose services are required to carry out the cult celebration. Among them are the spinner, the dyer, the purifier, the cook, etc. Finally, there is the general servant of the guild and a slave whose function is not stated. After his name comes *ἀφατεῖν*, which has been interpreted by Meister as an infinitive from *ἀφατος* in the sense of *οὐχ ὅσιον φάναι* (sc. ὅτι ποιεῖ).

This interpretation of Meister's appears to me to be far-fetched, and to put too heavy a weight of meaning on the alleged derivative from *ἀφατος*. I suggest that the word is a false or dialectic spelling of *ἀφετεῖν*. Other errors in spelling occur in the inscription, and for the West Greek tendency to use *a* for *ε* see Thumb, *Handbuch*, p. 125, and Buck, *Greek Dialects*, p. 21, para. 13. The word *ἀφετεῖν* would mean to be an *ἀφότης*, just as *νομοθετεῖν* means to be a *νομοθέτης*.

The word was used in Sparta to denote a class of slaves. A quotation is given in Athenaeus to the effect that the Lacedaemonians set many slaves free, of whom some were given the name *aphetae*, others *adespoti*, and still others *eryctae*.<sup>1</sup> The first and last of these evidently have to do with the racecourse, as the two verbs *ἀφίημι* and *ἐρύκειν* mean to start and to hold back to the line respectively. The Dioscuri at Sparta had the title *ἀφετήριοι*, 'starters of the race.' Pausanias found their shrine at the beginning of the course in Sparta. He also finds a statue of *Aphetaios*, and goes from the Market-place by the street *Aphetais*.

If my interpretation is right, the last-named person of the inscription is to

act as *ἀφότης*, 'starter,' in the festival of the two gods *ἀφετήριοι*, 'starters of the race.' It is perhaps right to infer from the passage cited from Athenaeus that such slaves became free and kept the name *aphetae*.

The word *ἀφότης* is further attested by Constantine<sup>2</sup> Porphyrogenitus, *de Caerimoniis aulae Byzantinae, καὶ φέρουσι ἡνιόχοι τοὺς ἀφέτας*.

And Eustathius II. p. 1024, says that *ἀφέτας* are *Εἰλωτας ἐλευθερωθέντας*.

I think that this Spartan custom may well throw light on the mysterious infinitive which ends the Dioscuri inscription.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

Vassar College.

#### FURTHER NOTES ON THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

4pollo 59:

	Κνίσῃ δέ τοι ἄσπερος αἰεὶ	58
μ	δῆρὸν ἀναξ εἰ βόσκοις περὶ τας . . . σ' ἔχωσιν	ET
γρ.	εἰ βόσκοισθε οἱ κε σ' ἔχωσιν	margo E
μ	δῆρὸν ἀναξ εἰ βόσκοις σ' ἔχωσιν	L
μ	δῆρὸν ἀναξ εἰ βόσκοις θεοὶ κε σ' ἔχωσιν	DK

The line, emended by various scholars, appears in Sikes and Allen's edition as:

δημοῦ ἀναΐξει, βόσκησεις ὅ' οἱ κε σ' ἔχωσιν

Prien conjectured *βόσκοις δέ κε*, neglecting *θεοί*; Mr. Agar *βόσκησθα δέ χ'*. . . I think it is possible to get a step nearer the MSS. than any of these:

δημοῦ ἀναΐξει, βόσκοις χ' ὅθεν οἱ κε σ' ἔχωσιν

'whereon thou couldst feed them that inhabit thee. . . .' I conceive that, as often, the first *κε* was at some stage written in full, and that lipography due to -οισκε- and -οικε- led to the version of ET and L.

After the corruption of *ἀναΐξει* to *ἀναξ εἰ*, the first *κε* seemed redundant and was dropped, whence DK's readings, -*θενοι* becoming *θεοι* through a contraction, perhaps.

Demeter, 99:

Παρθενίῳ φρέατι, MSS.: φρελατι Παρθενίῳ, Porson.

The well in question is not elsewhere called by this name: Pausanias (i. 39. 1)

<sup>1</sup> πολλάκις φησὶ ἡλευθέρωσαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι δούλους καὶ οὗς μὲν ἀφέτας ἐκάλεσαν οὗς δὲ ἀδεσπότεους οὗς δὲ ἐρυκτῆρας, Athen. 5, p. 271 f.

<sup>2</sup> Constant. *Caer.* 336, 10.

says it was called *Ἀνθιον* in the hymn of Pamphos. There seems some reason to think that, here and elsewhere, Pausanias may have confused the Homeric and the Pamphos hymns; for (1) his description of the plot of Pamphos' hymn coincides closely with that of ours; (2) according to him (ix. 31. 9) the flower by which Persephone was beguiled in Pamphos was the narcissus, and he regards this as the earliest mention of the flower: it seems strange then that he does not mention the occurrence of the narcissus in the Homeric version also, unless he is again confusing the two works in his citations from memory. It may be doubted, moreover, in the present passage, if either the MSS text, or Porson's correction is really satisfactory; for while the latter removes a gratuitous barbarism from the metre, it leaves us with a vague local dative—in *φρέατι*—to which *τραπέζῃ* (φ 35) seems the only discoverable parallel, and even so it may be urged that such a brachylogy might be permissible in a stereotyped phrase, 'at table,' where it would not be admissible in a more general application. It had occurred to me originally, therefore, that perhaps the truth in the present passage was something like *πὰρ φρέατ' Ἀνθείῳ*; but Mr. Agar points out to me that in old epic the stem of nouns in *-ar* is long (cf. *Homericæ*, pp. 353-6), and he suggests *φρέατ' ἐπ' Ἀνθείῳ*, which seems within easy conjectural distance of *παρθενίῳ φρέατι* if we suppose an error of misdivision in the first instance, and a subsequent transposition of the words, through the addition of *παρθενίῳ*, as a correction, *in margine*.

#### *Hermes*, 106:

*ἀθρόῡς οὖσας.*

Though it is perhaps just conceivable that *ἀθρόῡς* might be due to Hesiodic influence, and that *οὖσας* might be a late form, a combination of such incongruous licences seems unlikely; and the resulting sense, 'being collected,' is in any case extremely weak.

I would suggest *ἀθροισθείσας*, 'rounded up,' though the corruption may perhaps lie even deeper.

#### *Hermes*, 280:

*ἄλιον ὡς Μ. } μῦθον ἀκούων,  
τὸν cell. }  
τὸν δ' ἀπαλὸν γελάσας προσέφη κ.τ.λ.*

It seems to me indispensable to a straightforward interpretation of the passage that *ἄλιος μῦθος* be understood of Hermes' words.

Perhaps then: *ἄλιον δ' ὡς μῦθον ἀκούσας* (so Mr. Agar, remarking: 'Even Hermes could not speak and whistle simultaneously') *τοῖ' ἀπαλὸν γελάσας προσέφη*, etc. For *τοῖα* referring to a speech which follows cf. *Bacchylides* V. 160 (Housman, Ludwig, Jebb).

#### *Hermes*, 457:

*ἴξε, πέπον, καὶ θυμὸν ἐπαίνει πρεσβυτέροισι.*

I am disposed to suggest that this line conceals a double pun, and should be read—

*ἴξε, πέπον, θυμὸν τε πεπαίneo πρεσβυτέροισι,*

with a play on the literal and the idiomatic senses of *πέπον*, and on the normal and the metaphorical senses of *πεπαίνω*; cf. *πεπᾶναι ὄργην*, Ar. *Vesp.* 645; *ἦν πεπανθῆς*, Eur. *Heracl.* 159. The intermediate stage of corruption would be *θυμοντεπαίνεο*, altered to *καὶ θυμὸν ἐπαίνει* to restore the metre and a familiar word: cf. Bentley's *θυμὸν τε ἐκάστου* in the recurring *μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου* (E. 470 etc.).

#### *Hermes* 57-58:

*ἀμφὶ Δία Κρονίδην καὶ Μαιδάδα καλλιπέδιλον  
ὃν πάρος ὠρίζεσκον ἐταιρείῃ φιλότῃτι,  
MSS. (ὡς corr. ex. ὃν, Γ.)*

For *ὃν* read perhaps *ὦ*, 'who twain . . .' Clarke's *οἱ* does not carry much conviction. For dual subject with plural verb, cf. e.g. M. 131-2: and for confusion caused by unfamiliar dual forms, Θ. 378, M. 127. Here *ὦ* perhaps first passed into *ϕ*, and was then accommodated to the accusatives in the preceding line.

#### *Hermes* 383:

*μέγαν δ' ἐπιδέομαι ὄρκον, Μ.  
ἐπιδάιομαι cell.*

The best emendation is Barnes' *ἐπιδώσομαι*, but it is evidently unlikely. In 381 Hermes has said *Ἥελιον δὲ μάλ' αἰδέομαι*; therefore, I suggest, we should read here:

*μέγαν δὲ τ' ἐπαιδέομαι ὄρκον,*



'And besides, I reverence a great oath.' The elision was perhaps written in full at some stage, so that the intermediate step would be μέγαν δ' ἐπαιδέομαι ὄρκον. Attempts to restore metre at the expense of sense then produced the *voces nihili* which appear in our MSS.

R. J. SHACKLE.

# 'PLATO'S DEFINITION OF COLOUR' (C.R. XXXIV. p. 31).

WHY should this be called 'Plato's'? Socrates makes it quite clear that he wants something better. He says that he is answering Meno in the manner of Gorgias (κατὰ Γοργίαν) simply to please Meno. The theory of ἀπορροαί is traditionally attributed to Empedocles, and the exposition of it is presumably in the manner of Gorgias.

The remark, τραγικὴ γὰρ ἐστίν, ὦ Μένων, ἢ ἀποκρίσις, comes in quite naturally. The sense is, 'Please remember I am speaking in the character of Gorgias.' The actor's mask for Gorgias would surely be a tragic one. An American, asked about 'self-determination,' replied, 'That's a highbrow stunt,' and the suggestion of disagreement is the same. Mr. Wright's translation of τραγική as 'theatrical' misses the point, and is not supported by the context.

It is sufficient to point out that the Empedoclean definition of colour is extended to sound and smell in the passage just before τραγική. Even if the definition of colour is in terms that suggest the stage, which seems improbable, the mention of smell breaks the thread.

The three words selected, σχήματα, ὄψις and σύμμετρος, do not call up recollections of the stage. They would not occur to the ordinary man in the meanings thrust upon them to support Mr. Wright's translation; σχήματα, as figures in a dance, least of all, for surely a 'speaking' part is implied.

It is a pleasant coincidence that Sir Thomas Heath's *Euclid*, Book I., in Greek came to hand just as one was reading the *March Classical Review*, and Mr. Wright's note has given the hint

to look up the use Euclid makes of σχήματα and the other geometrical terms in the *Meno*. There are many helpful notes of the use made by Plato and Aristotle of terms, later defined by Euclid, and they supply a link that is missing in the equipment of most of us.

W. C. F. ANDERSON.


*Hermit's Hill,  
Burghfield Common,  
Berks.*

## BACCHYLIDES V. 142.

καὶ τε δαιδαλέας  
ἐκ λάρνακος ὠκύμορον  
φίτρὸν ἀγκλαύσασα· τὸν δὲ

KENYON: 'It may seem inconsistent that Althaea should weep for the death which is her own act; but it is an inconsistency true to nature, and a striking touch.'

But why then ἀτάρβακτος γυνά, 139? ἀγκλαύσασα, i.e. ἀγκλάφασα, from κλαφ: 'clavis': 'schliessen': 'slot.'

'Having unlocked the λάρναξ.' The ἀνα in 'unlock' meant originally 'up.' Cf. *Odyssey* 21, 47 θυρέων δ' ἀνέκοπτεν ὀχῆας, 'knocked up the bolts.' Inserting the κληίς, shaped Grecian key pattern  so as to miss the staples which held the δοιοὶ ὀχῆες (*Il.* 12, 455), Penelope 'knocked up' the bolts out of the staples, so that the doors could open.

E. J. BROOKS.

20, Cornwall Road,  
W. 11.

## DIOGENES LAERTIUS I. 104.

καὶ τοῦτο ἔφη θαυμασιώτατον ἑωρακένα παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ὅτι τὸν μὲν καπνὸν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καταλείπουσι, τὰ δὲ ξύλα εἰς τὴν πόλιν κομίζουσιν.

IN the *Class. Rev.* for 1917, p. 97, I suggested that emendation of καπνὸν was unnecessary, because Anacharsis was referring to the charcoal industry. May I now supply the proof? ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ σοφὸς Ἀνάχαρσις ἄλλ' ἅπτα τῶν Ἑλλήνων μεμφόμενος ἐπῆναι τὸν ἀνθρακίων ὅτι τὸν καπνὸν ἔξω καταλιπόντες οἴκαδε πῦρ κομίζουσιν (*Plutarch, Quaest. Conviv.* VI. 7, 2). For ξύλα in this sense compare Euripides, *Autolykos*,

fr. 283 (Nauck) : τοὺς ὄνους τοὺς λαγκωγοὺς ἐξ ὄρους οὔσειν ξύλα.

A. S. FERGUSON.

Queen's University,  
Kingston, Canada.

PLATO, *THEAETETUS* 188B.

καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστι τῷ μῆτε Θεαίτητον μῆτε Σωκράτη  
εἰδότες εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν λαβεῖν ὡς κτλ.

IN his note on this passage in the May-June number of the *Class. Rev.* Dr. Rouse draws attention to the difficulty of squaring Jowett's translation with the Greek text, and by way of relieving the situation he proposes to emend the text by inserting <ταὐτὸ> between καὶ τοῦτ' and by changing εἰδότες to εἰδόμενα. While admitting the ingenuity of this suggestion—which certainly seems at first sight to restore grammatical coherence to the clause and to simplify the task of giving a literal construe—yet I venture to think that no change is needed. Nay more, the passage as it stands seems to me more Platonic than Dr. Rouse's revised version. The old Latin translation gives some aid: 'et qui neque Th. neque S. agnovit, cogitare unquam potest S. Th. vel contra Th. S. esse.' This shows that ἔστι was taken as equivalent to ἔξεστι, which serves to explain its construction with the dative (cf. *Theaet.* 201B περὶ ὧν ἰδόντι μόνον ἔστιν εἰδέναι); and on referring to Ast's *Plat. Lex.* I find this view endorsed by him. But the τοῦτ(ο) still remains ignored by the Latin *et*. We can only take it as an adverbial accus., much like οὕτως or ita in sense. Though the plur. ταῦτα is more common in this use (almost = διὰ ταῦτα), yet several other examples of τοῦτο are to be found—e.g., *Laws* 686c, *Symposium* 204A; and obviously the sing. is the more suitable here. It is, perhaps, worth while to add that Carlill ('that is, for a man who knows neither Th. nor S.,' etc.) and Dyde, in their translations, are no more illuminating than Jowett.

R. G. BURY.

Gilling East,  
Yorks.

VIRGIL, *AEN.* II. 567-588.

As is well known, these lines, which contain the episode of Helen, are lacking in the best MSS., and are said by the Servian commentator<sup>1</sup> to have been deleted by Tucca and Varius. Whether in reality they were present in the copies of the *Aeneid* which were in common circulation in the period before 79 A.D. is a question raised by an interesting bit of archaeological material, the bearing of which in this connexion appears hitherto to have escaped attention. I refer to an ornamental helmet from the gladiatorial barracks at Pompeii,<sup>2</sup> bearing four series of scenes in high-relief.

The representations upon this helmet form the subject of a valuable article by the veteran Domenico Comparetti,<sup>3</sup> in which it is his great merit to have demonstrated that they illustrate not the *Iliupersis*, as had previously been thought, but the *Aeneid*. For the present purpose, we are concerned only with the main band of figures, which consists of five groups, viz. (from left to right): Ajax dragging Cassandra away from the altar of Minerva (*Aen.* II. 402-406); Pyrrhus slaying Priam (II. 550-558); in the centre of the band, Venus exhorting Aeneas to turn from the scenes of Troy's downfall and take his family to a place of safety (II. 589-620); Aeneas carrying Anchises (II. 721-723); Creusa, Iulus and Aeneas (II. 679-691). The background is formed by the city walls, within which these various scenes are enacted.<sup>4</sup> The correct interpretation of the central group, which had previously been taken to represent Helen and Menelaos, is due to Comparetti, and his demonstration is quite conclusive; with this help the composition of the whole five groups of figures is revealed as one of the most carefully arranged and perfectly balanced in the whole repertory of

<sup>1</sup> *Serv. in Aen.* II. 566, 592; *id.*, *Vita Verg.*

<sup>2</sup> Several helmets were found together; see the official guide to the antiquities in the Naples Museum, edited by A. Ruesch (1908), pp. 414-416.

<sup>3</sup> *Atene e Roma*, XXII. (1919), pp. 113-127.

<sup>4</sup> Comparetti's quotation, 'Troiae sub moenibus altis,' is not altogether apt, as the lines *Aen.* I. 95, X. 469, refer to the plain outside the city.

Roman imperial art: one may surmise that it was originally designed for some nobler and more conspicuous purpose than the adornment of a gladiator's helmet.

In one particular, the distinguished Florentine scholar seems not to have grasped the bearing of his interpretation—namely, its relation to the testimony which this series of scenes affords to the constitution of the vulgate text of the *Aeneid* in the early imperial epoch. Comparetti takes it for granted that the artist, in composing the central group, had in mind the episode of Helen (ll. 567-588) as motivating the wrath of Aeneas and the exhortations of his divine mother. Such a supposition, however, not only necessitates the further assumption that the figure of Helen was left to the imagination of the beholder, but through the intrusion of an additional element of interest disturbs the perfect symmetry and balance of the whole band of figures. Moreover, it is quite uncalled for, since just as in the text of the poet with ll. 567-588 omitted the agitation of Aeneas (ll. 559-563) which is soothed by the intervention of his mother (ll. 589-620) is motivated by the dire sights he has beheld, and in particular by the rape of Cassandra (ll. 402-406) and the slaying of Priam (ll. 550-558), so on the helmet these two scenes lead up to the central group, which in its turn serves as transition from the horrors of the last night of Troy to the migration toward Latium.

The artist of the Pompeian helmet or its prototype thought out his composition without reference to the episode of Helen; there is no reason for assuming that the text before him contained the lines in question; and although it is not permissible to draw the absolute conclusion that it did not contain them, the balance of probabilities seems to incline in this direction.

A. W. VAN BUREN.<sup>1</sup>

*American Academy in Rome.*

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above, I have seen two important discussions of the lines in question, which appeared in Germany during the War: R. Heinze, *Virgils Epische Technik*, third edition, pp. 45-51; and A. Körte, 'Zum Zweiten Buch von Vergils Aeneis,' in *Hermes*, li.

## SULLA AND CISALPINE GAUL.

'Data erat et Sullae provincia Gallia Cisalpina.' This snippet from the scrap book of Licinianus (ed. Teubner, p. 32, v. 14), which Mr. E. G. Hardy has brought to light again in his recent article on 'Transpadane Gaul,'<sup>2</sup> is one on which historians have mostly turned a blind eye.<sup>3</sup> It stands in apparent conflict with the fact that Sulla never was governor of Cisalpine Gaul; and it comes from a relatively late author whose unsupported evidence it is tempting to disregard altogether.

Yet Licinianus is not a wholly negligible writer. His materials are presented by him in an utterly chaotic form; but they appear to be derived from a good authority.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, his chapters on the age of Sulla, from which the above notice is drawn, are particularly full of accurate and credible information.<sup>5</sup> It is, therefore, worth inquiring whether his statement about Sulla and Cisalpine Gaul really deserves to be rejected off-hand.

Now Licinianus does not assert that Sulla actually went to Cisalpine Gaul: he merely says that this province was assigned to him. On what occasion could such an appointment have been made?

According to the received version, Cisalpine Gaul did not become a province until 81 B.C. In this case there is only one occasion on which it could have been offered to Sulla, viz. in 80 B.C., when Sulla held his second consulship, and so became qualified for a second proconsulship. Now it is expressly stated that the Roman people offered to elect Sulla to a third consulship in 79 B.C., although the tenure of two successive consulships would have

(1916), pp. 145-150. Both these writers are positive that the Helen episode is un-Virgilian, but they differ in their ideas as to what may have stood in its place, and as to Virgil's method of composition in this book.

<sup>2</sup> *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1916, pp. 66-7.

<sup>3</sup> It has not found a place even in Greenidge and Clay's *Sources of Roman History*, 133-70 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> His ultimate source is usually supposed to have been Livy.

<sup>5</sup> See book 35 (Teubner, pp. 15-30), relating to 87-4 B.C., and the passage on the rebellion of Lepidus (Teubner, pp. 33-5).

infringed Sulla's own laws.<sup>1</sup> In view of this fact, it does not seem too rash to assume that Sulla should also have been offered a proconsulship to which he was certainly entitled. And in this case Cisalpine Gaul would have been a peculiarly suitable province to select for him; for next to the possession of an army in Italy itself, the command of a force in Cisalpine Gaul was the best means by which a military man could dominate politics in Rome. It therefore appears at least possible that Sulla should have been appointed proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul during his second consulship.

But another course lies open to us if we accept the theory which Mr. Hardy has recently advanced on strong grounds, that Cisalpine Gaul became a province in 89 B.C.<sup>2</sup> In this case we may connect Sulla's appointment to that province with his first consulship in 88 B.C. True enough, the province to which Sulla was originally appointed, and to which he eventually repaired, was not Cisalpine Gaul, but Asia. But shortly after his original appointment Asia was taken away from him and given to Marius. Yet Sulla's claims to

a proconsulship of some sort were undeniable, and on being deprived of Asia he was plainly entitled to compensation. Moreover, the tribune Sulpicius, at whose hands Sulla lost Asia, was fair and conciliatory where his obligations to Marius did not tie his hands.<sup>3</sup> Though he made use of force to overcome the opposition of Sulla, he eventually came to an understanding with his adversary, and it is expressly stated that he forbore to deprive Sulla of his consulship.<sup>4</sup> All this creates a presumption that he did not disallow Sulla's claims to a proconsulship. We may, therefore, conjecture that Sulpicius, instead of simply dispossessing Sulla, effected a 'permutatio' which gave Sulla Cisalpine Gaul in lieu of Asia.

Thus, whatever date we adopt for the constitution of Cisalpine Gaul as a province, we can accept Licinianus' statement that Sulla was appointed governor of it. This statement is quite compatible with all the known facts of the case.

M. CARY.

<sup>3</sup> The Sulpician laws, taken as a whole, look like the work of a real statesman, and not of a mere partisan.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, *Sulla*, chap. viii. This admission comes from a writer whose ultimate source is manifestly unfriendly to Sulpicius.

<sup>1</sup> Appian, *Bell. Civ.* I. 103.

<sup>2</sup> *Loc. cit.* p. 63 sq.

## REVIEWS

### THE *ICHNEUTAE* OF SOPHOCLES.

*The Ichneutae of Sophocles.* With Notes and a Translation into English, preceded by Introductory Chapters, etc. By R. J. WALKER. 8vo. Pp. xviii + 664. London: Burns and Oates, 1919. £3 3s.

#### I

MR. WALKER's elaborate study of the *Ichneutae* of Sophocles, which has just made a welcome appearance, includes some very positive assertions concerning the text of the papyrus which seem to me so erroneous and so misleading that I am impelled to lose no time in expressing dissent. The passages which I have chiefly to criticise occur on

pp. 450 and 517-522. Mr. Walker's view is that the second hand has in lines 116-7 (Col. V. 13-14) deliberately set out to disguise the original reading; and it is suggested that this process has been applied to the text elsewhere. On p. xv of the Preface he writes: 'Alterations, not only avowed, but also, as I am convinced from the facsimile of Column V., in some cases unavowed and disguised, have been effected. How far such camouflage extends I have no idea. . . . the secrets of the papyrus have not yet been fully probed.' Were these suspicions well founded, it would be evident that my work as decipherer and editor, notwithstanding the generous



tribute on p. xv, has been but indifferently performed, and that a thorough revision is urgently required. The object of the following remarks is to reassure scholars on this head and to show that Mr. Walker has been deceived.

In the first place it should be observed that these novel and disquieting views are not based on a study of the original. So far from having made a minute examination of the papyrus (as was, perhaps not unnaturally, inferred by the writer of the notice of his book in *The Times Literary Supplement* for November 20), Mr. Walker has not even seen it, and his statements about lines 116-7 depend entirely upon the facsimile of Column V. given in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* IX. Now photographic plates of MSS. and especially of papyri are notoriously untrustworthy for palaeographical minutiae. Not only do they obscure differences in colour of ink (an important criterion for determining variations of hand), but they not seldom conceal what in the original is clear and turn small holes and other blemishes in the material into apparent traces of writing. Decipherments of partially effaced or broken letters and fine distinctions of hand are worthless unless confirmed by reference to the actual papyrus. The disadvantage of relying on photographic reproductions is well illustrated in another part of Mr. Walker's edition. On pp. 163-9 a lengthy discussion on the stichometry of the *Eurypylus* (*Pap. Oxy.* 1175) rests on the mistaken supposition that l. 28 of Frag. 5. Col. ii. was not the last of the column. 'The space (*i.e.* that below this line) is not blank,' he writes on p. 169. I reply that it is absolutely blank. Whatever 'unmistakable traces of a letter' he or others on whose opinion he relies may imagine that they detect in the facsimile, there are certainly none in the original; moreover both the preceding and following columns afford corresponding evidence, and the columns thus determined coincide in height with those of the *Ichneutae*, which, as Mr. Walker agrees (p. 169), was a sister manuscript. Reference to the papyrus would here have obviated several pages of fruitless discussion, just as elsewhere it would have

eliminated a number of inadmissible suggestions. For instance, on collating the five passages in Columns I. and II. of the *Ichneutae* where Mr. Walker proposes to modify my readings (ll. 15, 38, 44, 46, 50), I find that all these modifications are invalid; again, the combination adopted of Frags. 7 and 14 at ll. 386-7 and the amended readings in the latter fragment are patently impossible.

Let us now turn to the verses which Mr. Walker re-reads by the aid of the facsimile and analyses in detail on pp. 517 ff. (*cf.* p. 450). They are as follows:

τίν' αὐτέχνησταιν[. . .]. υρεσ' τιν' αὐ  
πρόσπαιονωδεκεκλιμ[. . .] κυνηγετεῖν

(the paragraphus above τίν' indicates a change of speaker.) These lines I interpreted thus:

(Σιληνός) τίν' αὐ τέχνην σὺ τήν[δ'] ἀρ' ἐξέυρες, τιν' αὐ;  
πρόσπαιον ὦδε κεκλιμ[ένον] κυνηγετεῖν.

Mr. Walker writes them

ξεῖν' αἰγέκνημ', εὖ τηλ[ύθεν μ' οἶθρε]. [Σι.] τιν' αὐ;  
πρός Πανός ὦδε κτλ.,

with the following comments, to which I add comments of my own.

'At the beginning of l. 116, where there is now a dash surmounted by a paragraphus, P<sup>2</sup> has erased, though very imperfectly, the handwriting of P, viz. ξ with a paragraphus underneath it. P presented no paragraphus above l. 116: the existing paragraphus over the line . . . has been manufactured by P<sup>2</sup> out of the top stroke of the ξ written by P.' The error of these statements seems to me fairly obvious even from the facsimile. The paragraphus is too high for the top stroke of the supposed original ξ; and the vertical stroke of my τ (Mr. Walker's dash) can be clearly traced. In the original there is no indication whatever of erasure or alteration.

'After the ξ of P . . . P<sup>2</sup> erases the handwriting of P which formerly stood in the second place in the line, and substitutes an ι bearing an acute accent. At the bottom, however, of this ι, on either side of it, he has left vestiges of what P wrote . . . they are portions of two separate letters written close together in the space appropriate to one letter only. That is as much as to say

that they are the diphthong *eu*.' These supposed vestiges of original writing are the edges of two small worm-eaten holes in the papyrus. The *ι* is clearly the unaltered writing of the first hand, and all that P<sup>2</sup> has done is to add an accent.

'In the fifth place of the line stands a *υ*. There exists no proof on the face of the papyrus that this *υ* is not the unaltered handwriting of P. But it is equally possible that it is made up of an *ι* written by P and of two top strokes added, without any erasure, by P<sup>2</sup>. I cannot agree that it is equally possible. The *υ* has all the appearance of having come unaltered from the pen of P.

'In the sixth place of the line stands a *τ*. There exists no proof on the face of the papyrus that this *τ* is not the unaltered handwriting of P. But it is equally possible that it is made up of a *γ* written by P, and of an extension of the top stroke effected, without any erasure, by P<sup>2</sup>. Again I must disagree, and with still greater conviction. Not only is there no sign of the *τ* having been retouched, but the *γ* would be an abnormal distance from the preceding letter, especially if that letter were, as supposed by Mr. Walker, originally *ι*.

'In the seventh place of the line stands an *ε*. A minute examination of this seems to establish that it was originally an *ι*. A very short but clearly visible straight stroke projects upwards from the point where the higher portion of the *ε* begins to curve round . . . Minute examination establishes no more than that the top of the *ε* was formed by a separate stroke, which was the scribe's usual practice.

'In the eighth place of the line stands a *χ* . . . the first stroke is not in this instance continuous. . . . The upper half meets the other stroke and then stops. The lower half of it starts independently from a point in the other stroke appreciably below that at which the juncture with the upper half is effected. The conclusion from this alone would probably be that the *χ* was originally a *κ* . . . But we have more than this to go on, seeing that in the centre of the *χ* a portion, though a very small portion, of the *κ* remains un-erased.' The *χ* is normal and un-

touched, the appearance of irregularity in the facsimile being due to small holes in the papyrus.

'In the eleventh place of the line stands a *υ*. It is fully legible, but the ink-marks are not sufficiently well preserved to indicate anything as regards alteration or erasure, except for the fact that the final stroke of the letter is singularly short. The shortness of this stroke would be explained by the hypothesis that P wrote a *μ* and that P<sup>2</sup> converted this *μ* into a *υ* . . . The *υ* is slightly rubbed, but I have no hesitation in attributing it to the first hand.

'In the twelfth place of the line stands a *σ*. . . . In the middle of it are two faint marks which might very well be the remains of the imperfectly erased cross-bar of an original *ε*.' This letter, like the preceding, is a little rubbed, but I believe it to be untouched.

'In the sixteenth place of the line stands a letter that is certainly *λ*, though Hunt gives it as *υ*.' This is perhaps the most obviously unwarranted of Mr. Walker's bold affirmations. It seems sufficiently evident even from the facsimile that the inclination of the two strokes is appropriate to *υ* and inappropriate to *λ*. In the original the base of the third stroke is clearly visible. I gave the letter as *υ* because it is *υ* and could not be read otherwise.

It would be tedious to carry the discussion further, and I will only add that there is no sign in the papyrus of any alteration of the remaining letters in this line or of those in the line following. What has been said may suffice to indicate that Mr. Walker is not a safe guide in matters of this kind. He is wonderfully erudite and ingenious, and it seems a pity that a book so full of these admirable qualities should be disfigured by the defects to which I have endeavoured to call attention.

A. S. HUNT.

*Queen's College, Oxford.*

## II

IT is a matter of congratulation that in these days when Greek studies seem to be losing their hold of our schools scholars should still be found who are ready to devote a large part of their lives to the

reconstruction and elucidation of even the second-rate products of the Greek genius. Mr. Walker is one of these scholars, and he has produced a book which goes into the greatest detail about all manner of questions that arise in connexion with the fragmentary play of Sophocles which was discovered in a papyrus some twelve years ago. That the play as we have it is unworthy of Sophocles does not matter. It is undoubtedly a valuable piece of evidence as to the nature of the satyric drama, and is thus closely connected with the great question as to the origin and development of tragedy and comedy in Greece. The whole subject is, as Mr. Walker says (p. 351), perplexed; we do not even know exactly what the definition of a 'satyric' drama is. As to the ultimate origin of tragedy—whether it originated in a passion play with Dionysus as its centre or, as Professor Ridgeway thinks, in the worship of dead heroes such as Adrastus (Herod. V. 67)—this is a question on which Mr. Walker does not pronounce an opinion. He is content to accept Pratinas as the inventor of 'a new genre, viz. satyric drama' (p. 314).

The chapter entitled 'The Vocabulary of the Play' is very carefully done, and ought to be useful to future editors. As to the text I am astonished to find how greatly Mr. Walker departs from his predecessors. Readings which had been generally accepted are here often rejected in favour of entirely new reconstructions of the fragments. To discuss these in detail would demand a very long review. But I am bound to say that I have often felt misgivings as to the soundness of Mr. Walker's methods and the validity of his results. For example in 197 εἴθε' ἐλεῖς is surely very strange Greek for 'thou wilt receive fine gold'; so, too, αἰγῶν τὴν ἀποιον for 'the she-goat that hath no pasture,' 95; and στίφρωμ' ἐν for 'our only strength,' 96. I do not think Mr. Walker throws any new light on the speech of Cyllene (213 ff.), which Professor Pearson calls the most puzzling passage of the text;

ἐλπες, l. 216, seems to me impossible. A curious feature of the translation which Mr. Walker has printed opposite his text is its predilection for biblical words and phrases. One often wonders whether they are really appropriate to a satyric drama.

Two chapters deal with the metres: (1) Choric metres, (2) Non-Choric metres. The latter is associated with a discussion of the practice of Pratinas, and five conclusions are drawn as to this matter (p. 248 f.). Considering that it is at least doubtful whether any specimen of the satyric verse of Pratinas survives, the structure is necessarily built upon a succession of hypotheses. For example, it is a large assumption that the lines preserved from the satyric play of Sositheus (p. 190) are any guide as to the practice of Pratinas. Nor can the practice of Pratinas decide any question as to the metrical structure of lines of the *Ichneutai* of Sophocles. Mr. Walker does not here show any skill in the 'ars nesciendi.' He is too ready to trust to a chain of evidence with weak links in it. Incidentally one reads with astonishment the suggestion (p. 213) that l. 967 of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and other lines in the neighbourhood, including l. 943, were written by the poet not in iambic trimeters, but in the dochmiac metre. This suggestion is based simply on the multiplication of trisyllabic feet in a single line. 'Trisyllabic feet' is a term of which Mr. Walker is very fond; but the different kinds of trisyllabic feet stand on very different footings. The tribrach (with resolution of the 'rise') is a very different thing from the anapaest (with a disyllabic 'fall').

This brief notice fails, I know, to do justice to the learning and patience exhibited by the writer in a difficult piece of work. I can well believe that in 'driving his random plough through fields already ploughed' he may, unlike 'the silly Cyclicranian,' have really found some cups of gold (p. 269).

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

## BEITRÄGE ZUR GRIECHISCHEN RELIGIONSGESCHICHTE III.

*Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte III.* By S. EITREM. One volume. 10" x 7". Pp. 202. Kristiania, in Kommission bei Jacob Dybwad, 1920.

THE debt of scholarship to the activities of the Scandinavian savants grows steadily. In this book, largely a supplement to the *Opferritus* of the same author, we have a not inconsiderable contribution. A series of articles of varying length discuss the use of water in ritual, the avoidance of foreign elements in cult—with some curious exceptions to the general rule that whatever is not native is unacceptable—the *ὄλολυγή*, and religious and other processions; while the last three essays ('Aineias und die Kaukonen,' 'Zwillingspaare und mythische Doppelbildungen,' 'Die mythische Kolonialbegründer der Griechen') also include points of literary and historical criticism. We do not propose to give a full analysis and critique of these works, a task which could not be completed in a moderate space, but simply to draw attention to a few points of interest, particularly those on which we think that the views of the author might be enlarged or modified.

One matter which calls for notice is what seems to us to be a tendency to explanations simpler than the facts will allow. The chief illustration of this is the frequent assumption (e.g., pp. 22, 24, 25, 33, 37) that hero-cult is the oldest and simplest form of ritual, at any rate of chthonian ritual, and that the more elaborate forms may be supposed to derive from or replace it. Now we would by no means deny that such development or replacement has often taken place in Greece and elsewhere; what we would emphasise is, that to picture an early stratum of cult consisting wholly of ghost-worship is to give a one-sided and incomplete view. It needs no very deep research into anthropological data—a kind of research which our author can and does make with profit—to teach us that, while we find no example of human beings quite without any ideas of magic

or religion, we find not a few wholly without a cult of the dead, or even a fear of ghosts or a regular ritual of burial. Hence we should not lightly assume that if the Greeks mostly avoided using any material from over the local border in ritual, it was because the border, and the land within it, were sanctified by ancestral graves. They were indeed so sanctified, and the resulting cult was usually an intensely local one; but the idea of avoiding anything foreign may be older yet. This place is holy ground; it has *mana*, as shown by its power to produce food-plants or what not; that place also has *mana*: both are mysterious and potent forces, and to mix them is dangerous. What if they should not agree? A more analytical age told tales of strife between two heroes, or reflected, *χωρίς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν*; but the idea is so widespread and so ancient that it may well have appeared among the Greeks before hero-cult began, early as that undoubtedly is. Especially, we would not assume that the cult of Gaia is later than the cult of heroes or other local daimones. To personify and worship the Earth, meaning thereby the whole planet, or such part of it as is known to the worshippers, involves indeed a considerable power of abstraction; but we very much doubt if originally Gaia was anything more than the particular plot of ground with which the celebrants were most familiar; just as Demeter seems to have been originally no goddess of corn in general, but the Corn-mother of some particular field. Eitrem well remarks (p. 27) that the intense fondness for the native soil is likely to last as long as 'die Menschen ein Heimatsgefühl kennen,' and draws attention to the very vague Latin expression *tutela huius loci*. We would suggest that a potent factor in such feelings was originally that liking for the known which every child shows, and in particular the strong preference for known magic.

While dealing with this essay, we would point out what seems to us an ill-advised comparison—namely, that



which is drawn on p. 22 between human sacrifices to chthonian powers, whether ghosts or other, and the Roman *deuotio*. The former seems to us to be originally a simple gift of blood, or life, to strengthen the power of the soil or its spirits; the latter is much more sophisticated, for it is a contract whereby the infernal deities are offered a life on condition that they take at the same time the hostile army. They must have both or neither.

The discussion of the *ὁλοθυγή* brings out the important fact that it is not necessarily, though it is often, a cry of joy, still less one of grief, as some have tried to make out. We would suggest that it is in its origin nothing more than a natural cry of excitement, and that this explains its utterance at a critical moment of a religious ceremony, such as the death of the victim or the manifestation of a divine presence. In either case the rite has succeeded in producing a magically potent force, and in face of this it is no easy task to keep quiet. We feel that a close investigation of sacrificial ritual by a good psychologist, especially one who had studied the psychology of crowds, would yield very instructive results.

The excellent discussion of processional ritual suggests the following, among other considerations. The Greek funeral procession differs but little in its arrangements from any other; contrast, *e.g.*, our own military funerals, in which the cortège seems to make an elaborate pretence of going backwards (senior officers in the rear, arms reversed, etc.), presumably with the original intention of misleading the ghost. It would seem, then, that the Greek dead were but little feared, but rather treated like any other honoured persons, human or divine, and that consequently we should not be too ready to deduce their ritual from terror of the ghost.

The least satisfactory of all the essays seems to us that on Aeneas, which rests upon what we venture to characterise as the exploded separatist theory of the authorship of the *Iliad*, and also upon the idea, less common in Great Britain than on the Continent, that much information about Greek cult and saga is to be found in small details of the

Homeric poems, such as the exact names of the actors in minor episodes. Why, the author asks, does Poseidon, in T 328, rescue Aeneas from Achilles, and bring him to the ranks of the Kaukones, who elsewhere appear only in the 'late' Doloneia? He suggests that it is because the Kaukones are really a Peloponnesian tribe and Aeneas a Peloponnesian divinity. We do not criticise the arguments—to our thinking, often very hazardous—by which these conclusions are arrived at; we merely ask why, in that case, the author of T, whoever he was, supposed that Aeneas was a Trojan prince and the Kaukones an Asiatic people. If the theory of Eitrem rid us of real difficulties of interpretation, we might be content to waive such objections; but we fail to find any such difficulties. Poseidon's quarrel is with the reigning House of Troy, not with its junior branch, to which Aeneas belongs; he knows that that prince is destined to rule over the remnant of the nation which survives the war, and like all the gods, even Zeus when the latter is not identified with Moira, he bends to its decrees and rescues the future king. And how could he do this more effectually than by snatching him from his post of danger opposite Achilles, somewhere about the centre of the line, to the extreme left, where the poet has placed the Kaukones, whoever they may be (K 430)? That the same obscure name is to be found in the Peloponnesos, and that Aeneas had a cult there, are facts which strike us as no more extraordinary than that in later times there were Lokrians in Italy as well as in Greece, and that in that same country the worship of Herakles and Diomedes flourished.

The appendix to this article contains some interesting remarks on the cult of Hades in the Western Peloponnesos, and its probable conjunction with solar ritual; this last being a possibility to which some of us are perhaps apt to pay too little attention, now that it is no longer fashionable to find solar myths everywhere. The sixth essay we could have wished longer, especially in view of the researches of Dr. Rendal Harris on the 'Heavenly Twins,' since it deals with an allied subject; while the last to

some extent continues the same subject, owing to the large number of pairs of brothers who are credited with founding colonies in very early times. In this connexion more might perhaps have been made of the magical importance of twins or, as is seen in the legend of Herakles, of the elder twin. Much of the material naturally consists of names,

which the author rightly characterises (p. 171) as 'spröden Stoff, der . . . viele Irrwege bietet'; but to criticise his conclusions, many of which are not at all obvious, would involve going into much detail and extending this notice beyond due limits. H. J. ROSE.

*University College,  
Aberystwith.*

#### BYWATER'S FOUR CENTURIES OF GREEK LEARNING IN ENGLAND.

*Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England.* Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on March 8, 1894. By INGRAM BYWATER, Regius Professor of Greek 1893-1908. 8vo. One vol. Pp. 20. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1919. 1s. 6d. net.

THIS lecture, which Bywater probably thought too slight for publication, has been found among his notebooks and is issued from the press of his University. It is the business-like performance of a good scholar who did not aspire to be an indifferent man of letters; and readers who wish to hear about the Greek spirit may leave it alone.

The greatest part of it is occupied with matter of the least importance. The renaissance of learning in England is history in which Bywater was at home, and he collects a large number of details which I presume to be accurate and which have some interest of a purely antiquarian sort. But those were the years when we were learning Greek and were not yet in case to teach it: our contribution to the European fund begins with the seventeenth century. In Bywater's account of this period there is nothing which I can gainsay of my own knowledge; though I should have thought that Pearson, of whom Bentley said that the very dust of his writings was gold, and Porson that he would have equalled even Bentley as a critic in Greek if he had not muddled his brains with divinity, deserved more prominence than is given him. The two pages on Bentley himself are excellent; and laymen who wonder at the fame of this tasteless and

arbitrary pedant, and the reverence paid him by every competent judge, will hardly find elsewhere in so small a compass so clear a definition of his unique originality and greatness.

But in Bywater's sketch of Greek scholarship after Bentley there are places where I find his judgment or his knowledge defective. He says with truth that Bentley's chief successors, excepting Taylor and in some measure Toup and Tyrwhitt, were mostly occupied, like Bentley himself, with the poets; and I surmise that for this very reason they were not familiar to Bywater.

The school of Bentley, if the expression may be hazarded, Markland, Dawes, Musgrave, Warton, and the rest, allowed itself to be absorbed in the study of the Greek poets. If I were asked who was the strong man and chief figure in this company, I should say with little hesitation, Richard Dawes.

Warton makes a strange appearance here, though far be it from me to blame Bywater or anyone else for ignorance of his large and empty Theocritus; and I should have liked to watch Bentley from a safe distance in Elysium when he heard the expression hazarded that Warton was one of his school. Although the preeminence assigned to Dawes is disputable, I will not dispute it, and I grudge him no praise; but *strong* is not the right word to praise him with. His special virtue was a preternatural alertness and insight in the two fields of metre and grammar, the more extraordinary because his mere learning was not profound. The *strong* man of the company was Markland, devoid of these peculiar qualities, but superior in range and vigour and general activity of mind.

It is probable that Englishmen are right in counting Porson the second of English scholars, but many judges on the Continent would give that rank to Markland. He is the only one except Bentley who has been highly and equally eminent in Greek and Latin; and I believe that Bentley did him the honour, extravagant I admit, to be jealous of him.

Porson . . . is . . . a model of caution and patience, not an impetuous genius like Bentley or Dawes.

Certainly Porson had less genius and less impetuosity than Bentley, but he had as much genius as Dawes, and Dawes had not much more impetuosity than Porson: those who think he had are misled by the effervescence of his style, and its unlikeness to Porson's constraint. There may have been impetuosity, or at least some lack of caution, in Dawes's canon about *ὄπας μῆ* with the 1st aor. subj. active and middle and his alteration of Ar. *Ach.* 633 and *Pac.* 918, but so there was in Porson's pronouncement on the form of the 2nd pers. sing. pres. indic. passive and his destruction of the metre of *Eur. Med.* 629.

The Porsonian school, Blomfield, Monk, and Elmsley, if I may include him among them, continued Porson's work on the dramatists, though with little of Porson's freshness or felicity of touch.

This is true of Monk, if not of Blomfield, but of Elmsley it is false and

unjust. Elmsley no doubt was distinctly inferior to Porson as an emendator, though still a good one, but he was not much inferior as an observer and discoverer in grammar and metre, and his writing has a candour and a pleasant irony which are graces not easily to be matched. See how Nauck and Wilamowitz speak of him, or hear the words of his great antagonist Hermann:

Est enim P. Elmsleius, si quis alius, uir natus augendae accuratiori Graecae linguae cognitioni, ut cuius eximia ac plane singularis in peruestigandis rebus grammaticis diligentia regatur praeclaro ingenio, mente ab auctoritatibus libera, animo ueri amantissimo, neque aut superbia aut gloriae studio aut obiectandi cupiditate praepedito, his ille uirtutibus id est consecutus, ut, cum doctrina eius maximi facienda sit, non minus ipse sit amandus atque uenerandus.

And this one slighting mention is all that the Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford could spare for the most famous scholar that Oxford ever produced. He continues 'if the mantle of the master descended on anyone, it was rather on Dobree.' It is very hard to decide between the merits of Dobree and Elmsley: I should say that the mantle came in two and half of it fell on each; Dobree was the shrewder emendator and Elmsley the subtler grammarian.

The statement on p. 15 that 'Porson edited Photius' is not strictly true, and on p. 18 the death of Badham is postdated by five years.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

#### MY COMMONPLACE BOOK.

*My Commonplace Book.* By J. T. HACKETT. Pp. xvii+403. Fisher Unwin. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS interesting *farrago* of memorable extracts, both in prose and verse, will be reviewed in other journals upon its general merits; here we have space only to notice what concerns us most. This is Mr. Hackett's diatribe against the 'classical enthusiast' who fails to see 'the inferior state of civilisation among the Greeks, their non-moral character in certain respects, their ignorance and superstition, and their low standard of morality generally'

(p. 371). Not that Mr. Hackett is inimical to classical scholarship—on the contrary, he appreciates 'the beautiful Greek language and its glorious literature'—but he holds that the admiration of the 'classical enthusiast' for these things has perverted his sense of truth. His animadversions are contained in some half-dozen notes in which he criticises adversely the enthusiasm for Greek things of writers like R. W. Livingstone, George Gissing, F. W. Myers, Gilbert Murray, and A. E. Zimmern. Thus he has the courage of his point of view, and might have said with Cicero, '*Amicus Plato,*

*amicus Socrates, sed magis amica veritas.*'

This point of view is always interesting, and is advanced by Mr. Hackett with such obvious sincerity that it deserves great respect; but it seems to me to be vitiated partly by the peculiar conditions of the time in which it was formed, partly by the fact that 'a little learning is a dangerous thing,' and, lastly, by a failure to see the wood for the trees. Thus Mr. Hackett tells us that a large proportion of his extracts were collected some thirty or forty years ago, when the influence of Darwin and of Herbert Spencer still caused an upheaval in the minds of men, and his own judgment is not unshaken by that commotion, as for example, when he approves (p. 209) of the dismissal of Ancient Ethics as 'almost entirely grossly wrong and great rubbish' (p. 208), in a letter written by his friend Richard Hodgson in 1881. Again, his knowledge that the Greeks indulged in unnatural vice, and were a sensual race generally, leads Mr. Hackett to give a suggestion of impurity to things like Sappho's *ἡμερόφωνος ἀήδων* (p. 292-3), and the Charites themselves. There is no getting away from the existence of these unpleasant aspects of Greek life, but the important thing is that *the Greeks were never morbid about them*. Someone has said that when a modern writer, such as Ibsen, looks out of his window his gaze becomes riveted upon a dead dog which happens to be decaying in the foreground; a Greek would overlook the dog and see the beauty beyond. Christian ethics preach 'If thy right eye offend, pluck it out'; the Greeks taught—as, for example, Plato in the *Symposium* on this very question of *παιδεραστία*—that, if a man's body impedes the activity of his soul, he should set it at rest by giving it, so far as *σωφροσύνη* allows, its desires, so that it may cease to worry the soul. The result in both cases is the same—*i.e.*, spiritual *ἀταραξία*—attained, in the one case by the mortification of the flesh, and in the other by the highest development of all our faculties. That the Greeks were wrong on this particular point we all admit, but their attitude

was at any rate better than a morbid one, and it is a mistake to imagine, as Mr. Hackett does, that their whole attitude to life was coloured by it. Similarly, with the exposure of children, for the practice of which Mr. Hackett (p. 173) would have us regard the Greeks with the same horror with which we would regard those who practised it to-day, it must be admitted that, from a eugenic point of view, modern sentimentality upon the point is not entirely a virtue; and it is not to be wondered at that it should have been practised by a race who were necessarily strangers to the peculiarly Christian conception of the worth of the individual soul as such. Our attitude upon the matter is an ethically higher one than the Greek, but knowledge of this is indeed a dangerous thing when it leads Mr. Hackett to attribute to the Greeks a 'low standard of morality generally.' Moreover, his knowledge of the facts is sometimes not complete—*e.g.*, on 'the seclusion of women,' he seems unaware that by the time of Euripides it was beginning to be assailed, and he omits all reference to Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* upon the general question of women—and even when his facts are right his conclusions are apt to be rash. Thus, in an examination of Professor Murray's translation of the *Bacchæ* of Euripides (pp. 371 ff.), he has no difficulty in showing that certain words and phrases in that 'translation' constitute a misrepresentation of the original Greek words and phrases; consequently, he argues, the whole of Professor Murray's rendering misrepresents the spirit of Euripides. This is what I mean by his failure to see the wood for the trees. At times his criticism is rather captious, as of Mr. R. W. Livingstone's *Greek Genius and its Meaning to us* (pp. 290 ff.), where, in criticising the preference of the elements of 'directness' and 'truthfulness' (by which Mr. Livingstone characterises the best Greek poetry) to the imaginative element of modern poetry, he objects that such a preference would lead to the 'scrapping' *inter alia*, of 'all Greek statuary'!

R. B. APPLETON.



## ASPECTS, AORISTS, AND THE CLASSICAL TRIPOS.

*Aspects, Aorists, and the Classical Tripos.*

By JANE E. HARRISON. Cambridge University Press, 1919. Price 2s. 6d.

IN this little book a theory of the Russian Perfectives is presented, which, if not new, is yet developed by Miss Harrison with so much eloquence, cogency of argument, and brilliance of illustration, that the general truth of it shines clear.

The similarity, however, both in structure and function, of the Russian 'Perfective' to the Greek Aorist has been recognised by Slavonic scholars from the time of Lomonosoff, Miklovitch, and Morfil, while the strong general resemblance between the two languages in the matter of prepositions, participles, oratio obliqua, diminutives, and even specific idioms, such as 'sam tchetvert' = τέταρτος αὐτός (but these have been, probably, directly borrowed), is at once obvious to all who possess both languages. The Russian version, for example, of the New Testament fits the Greek like a glove: Aorists and Perfects are answered by 'Perfectives,' Imperfects and Presents by 'Imperfectives,' cases by similar cases, compound Greek words by similarly compounded Russian words, diminutives by diminutives, and so forth; so that the many mistakes in tenses, etc., to be found in our Authorised Version (*cf.* Acts ii. 47, etc.) do not occur in the Russian. It retains, moreover, the directness and homely simplicity of the original, of which so much has evaporated in West European translations.

But it is especially about the subtle and systematic way in which the Russian language discriminates between fact and process, between the *actum* and the *actio*, that Miss Harrison discourses with much learning and charm, finding in the omnipresence of the 'Imperfective' in the Russian Verb system, not merely a stark linguistic fact, but the indication of a people's temperament. Nor is there anything fantastic in such a theory; for the Russian is proclaimed, both by his language and by his literature, to be a

born Bergsonian, a Heracleitean by nature, whose care is not for the 'stiff and dead' fact, but for the perpetual flux, for the stream of things on which, not having yet developed the hard and cutting will of the Westerner, he is perhaps too prone to drift. He loves the great river, whether dark and turbid in storm or 'dimpling innumably' in calm—all of it from the shining surface to the darkest depth. Hence his warm 'Imperfectives,' the gripping power and poignancy of his acting—and there is none other like it in the world. Hence, too, the singular amorality of his literature; for the Russian writer, keenly conscious of the vast life-stream flowing through and about him, is content to feel and describe it, without wishing in the least to measure its immensity with a moral foot-rule—ὡς τῷ μὲν θεῷ καλὰ πάντα καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ δίκαια, ἄνθρωποι δὲ ἃ μὲν καλὰ ὑπελήφασιν, ἃ δὲ αἰσχροῦ.

Russian literature is pronounced by Miss Harrison to be found disappointing by the learner. As to this judgment opinions may differ; but what will chiefly interest students of language is the fact that Miss Harrison roughly equates the Russian Perfective with the Greek Aorist.

Now in the autumn of 1916 your reviewer was fortunate enough to discuss the question of Aspects at some length with certain professors of Moscow University; and these were the conclusions reached:

- (1) Russian grammatical terminology is cumbrous, antiquated, and unnecessarily perplexing to the foreigner. Reform is urgently needed in many directions.
- (2) All Russian linguistic phenomena are paralleled in other members of the Indo-European family.
- (3) There are but two essential 'Aspects' of the Russian Verb: one the 'Perfective,' indicating the naked fact without reference to its duration, etc.; the other the 'Imperfective,' connoting continuance, duration, process, frequency, etc.

But this (3) is the precise difference between Aorists and Imperfects in Greek. And many of the subtler tense usages of Latin and Greek are closely paralleled in Russian, as, for example, the Gnostic Aorist, the Aorist of Indefinite Frequency (+*av*), the so-called Epistolary Past Imperfect in Latin, etc.

The fact, therefore, that a Joint Committee representing the Standing Committee on Grammatical Reform, of which Professor Sonnenschein is the indefatigable chairman and guide, and the Modern Language Association has recommended the disuse of the terms 'Aspect,' 'Perfective,' 'Imperfective,' and the use of the terms 'Aorist Stem' and 'Imperfect Stem' in their stead, is one of great interest and importance, which seems to be unknown to Miss Harrison.

It is good that Russian grammar should at last be brought into line with the grammar of its sister languages; it is even better that the study of the Russian language should be made much easier than it has hitherto proved owing to the use of grammatical terms which are perplexing to the general. In one school in this country where sixty boys are studying Russian, the reformed terminology has been in use for nine months, with the most satisfactory results.

The reformed terminology, once its clearness, simplicity, and adequacy are realised, should find ready acceptance, and overcome the constitutional inertia of even the most conservative amongst grammarians.

LLOYD STORR-BEST.

Sheffield.

### LE CULTE DES HÉROS.

*Le Culte des Héros chez les Grecs*: Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Tome XLII. By M. P. FOUCART. One volume. 4to. Pp. 166. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1918. 6 fr. 20 c.

THE greater part of this work (pp. 34-166) consists of an account, set forth with the clearness of expression and unostentatious learning of which the French are masters, of the origin and growth of hero-cults from Mycenaean times to the end of paganism. All the features of the normal worship of this kind—*ἐναγίσματα*, nocturnal rites, the *ἐσχάρα*, and so on—are recounted with a sufficiency of example; and a clear and plausible, if not startlingly original, explanation is given of the beginning of the cult in the reverence paid to great chiefs and kings after their death, the continuance of the worship of these prehistoric figures, looming all the more majestic across the intervening centuries, the gradual extension to more recent but still remarkable persons such as Aristomenes, and the degradations, vagaries, and confusions which attended the ritual in later times. With all of this we can only agree, save here and

there in detail, for the author, as he is rather fond of reminding us, clings closely to what the Greeks really said and did. It is a merit in anyone, but especially in one of such wide knowledge as M. Foucart, to find out and explain exactly what it was that they did say and do. Here common sense, patience, and critical ability serve the author well. It is when he tries to explain why they said and did such things that we find him less satisfactory.

The first thirty-four pages, and many passages elsewhere in the monograph, are devoted to lively polemic against certain comparative mythologists whose combinations have aroused M. Foucart's wrath. The first chapter proclaims in its heading that 'les Héros ne sont pas d'anciens Dieux déçus de leur dignité,' and the author then proceeds to prove to his own satisfaction that Erechtheus is not Poseidon, that Pandrosos and Aglauros are quite credible princesses, that Hyakinthos is no vegetation-deity, and that Lykurgos is as real a legislator as Sulla. Opinions differ as to what is probable; for our own part, a king who is born direct from the ground and a princess who is named All-dewy must bring fairly solid credentials before we

will accept them as figures of ancient chronicle or saga, and when we are told that no Athenian ever regarded them as anything but real human beings, however much he may have disbelieved in certain fabulous details of their stories, we remember that St. Demetra's worshippers seem to have no doubt that she was a real woman who lived in Levsina and suffered from Turkish misrule. That some of the views M. Foucart combats are absurd we do not deny; but we maintain most strongly that the true answer to such absurdities is to be found in a better understanding of the Comparative Method, not in its rejection because some have abused it. Thus, we venture to state that the Hyakinthos whom our author demolishes (p. 10) is a man of straw, as repugnant to sane comparative mythology as to his critic's common-sense, the offspring of an ill-assorted alliance between solid ritual fact and late aetiological myth; and that to prove the equation of Erechtheus with Poseidon unsatisfactory, as indeed we think it to be, leaves it as likely as ever that the 'hero' was a water-daimon of some sort and no king of the Mycenaean or any other epoch.

Indeed M. Foucart's dislike of the hero who is a faded god leads him almost entirely to forget the much more substantial figure of the hero who is a vigorous and flourishing, if renamed, daimon. The Taraxippoi are a case in point; the one at Nemea, where materialism seems to have been rampant, was nothing but a stone; Olympia had a daimon, the Isthmus revered Glaukon, son of Sisyphos, who made the horses shy in the chariot-races (Paus. VI. xx. 19). Similar transformations of Roman 'sondergötter' into dead men are fairly common. This is Euhemerism or Spencerianism, if you will; but long before either of those philosophers saw the light it was a common thing to explain a vague and unknown power by supposing him to be a ghost. Some such tendency would appear to have been particularly active in the case of Herakles. He may have been the rough but good-hearted captain of condottieri that M. Foucart supposes him; by anyone who reads through the

brief account of his rituals in Nilsson's *Griechische Feste*, for example, will be much puzzled to explain on merely heroic lines how he came to be metamorphosed into a quasi-feminine deity of fertility. M. Foucart indeed (p. 21) is inclined to accept with modifications Herodotos' view that there were two persons of that name, one a Greek hero and the other a foreign god; which to us is very like saying that the Hebrews worshipped two Yahwehs, one a deity of their own and the other a by-form of Dionysos introduced from Greece.

The author's neglect of comparative religion is nowhere more deplorable than when his views are probably right. He insists that the cult of heroes and the ordinary tendence of the dead are two different things, and we agree with him. But by way of proof he has little but an *ipse dixit*; in early days the kings were all-important, their subjects of no account; therefore the former were naturally worshipped, the latter were not (p. 44). But individually the Romans were of little importance, after their death in particular, in early times; hence there are no hero-cults in Rome. But the Di Manes were collectively formidable and to be propitiated. Why are there no such figures in Greek cult? We think the answer is to be found in a careful interpretation of the Greek facts in the light of the practice of other nations. That the Greeks generally, or at least the Athenians, expected their dead to be reborn is highly likely (see *Classical Review*, 1895, pp. 247 ff.) for the early times in which the best-known of the hero-cults grew up. But if we glance at other peoples who have such beliefs for the generality of their dead, we find that they hold as strongly as any Pythagorean that certain of the dead are too important ever to come back to earth as babies. To a Greek these exalted spirits, captains, kings, and so forth, were permanently in the other world and to be worshipped as heroes. Thought about such beings is always more or less confused and contradictory; how confused neither M. Foucart nor many other investigators fully realise, or the idea that cremation and inhumation imply different beliefs would not

die so hard; and consequently the same hero might easily be placed in a vague underworld and in a perfectly locatable grave. In either case, he occupied much the same position as many spirits who had never been in human bodies,

and upon whom such things as the harvest depended. Thus we have one of the factors leading to the confusions and border-line cases which make investigation in this field so difficult.

H. J. ROSE.

#### THE LEWES HOUSE COLLECTION OF ANCIENT GEMS.

*The Lewes House Collection of Ancient Gems.* By J. D. BEAZLEY. 4to. Pp. xii+124. 12 collotype and 2 half-tone plates. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1920. 38s. net.

ENGRAVED gems are a branch of art little known except to professional archaeologists, and that for two reasons: first, they are troublesome to examine, especially in museums; and secondly, the fine pieces are apt to pass undetected among the mass of indifferent work. Yet, though the names of Polyclitus and Euphronios sit lightly on many lips innocent of Dexamenos and Epimenos, the great sculptors and vase-painters are not more surprising artists than the great gem-engravers. Consider only stones reproduced in this book—Mr. Warren's Archer, for instance, or his Achilles and Penthesilea; the exquisite Eros on a New York scaraboid, or the British Museum Goat from Lecce, where in a square inch of intractable material the unknown artist has wrought a design comparable in sweep and grandeur with Simone Martini's Guidoriccio da Fogliano—and the artistic supremacy of Greece will be as evident as in the finest red-figured vases or in the Parthenon frieze. And if a knowledge of gems is important for the understanding of Greek achievement, for the understanding of Etruscan it is essential, since it is in gems and bronzes alone that that art-loving people has left an adequate memorial of itself.

In addition to the reasons given above for the neglect of gems by all but specialists, there has hitherto existed a third—that there is no book in which their beauty and importance are at once apparent. The books mingle the indifferent with the good in a proportion moresparing indeed than most museums,

but still too great to encourage a timid enquirer. That cause, however, exists no longer, and we can imagine no more fascinating introduction to the subject than this catalogue. Mr. Warren's cabinet, which contains 132 intaglios and 7 cameos, is surpassed in numbers by other private collections—Lord Southesk's, for instance; but in average quality it is superior to any collection known to us, public or private, and if the British Museum be excepted, far superior. It is, moreover, particularly rich in Greek and Etruscan work, and the proportion of really first-rate pieces is quite astonishing. The excellent plates of this book should be a revelation to every one in any way interested in ancient art.

If the reader turns from the plates to Mr. Beazley's text with an expectation, aroused by the author's epoch-making work among vases, of finding the artistic personalities of various gem-engravers reconstructed, he will be disappointed. Minute scale and high finish together make the application of Morellian methods to gems extremely difficult, and though Mr. Beazley has a few suggestions of this kind to make, his results do not seem to us very certain, and it is not upon them that the merits of his commentary depend. We say commentary advisedly, for his text is much more than a mere catalogue. Mr. Beazley supplies an unusually elaborate account of each stone, and deals fully, though concisely, with any question raised by it. It is rarely that he allows himself to be drawn into stylistic digression—too rarely the reader will probably think, for his digressions are extremely interesting—but he displays in interpretation and illustration not only a very remarkable command of all branches of ancient art



and its voluminous literature, but also much curious information on other subjects. This is hardly the place for detailed criticism of a very scholarly piece of work, but archaeologists will note the attention here for the first time devoted to the backs of scarabs. The verbal descriptions would be easier to understand if we had been allowed a diagram, but no one who has handled gems can doubt that this is a field of enquiry which deserves much more attention than it has yet received.

We have found ourselves regretting more than once that the nature of this

book has precluded the author from prefacing his account of the individual stones with a general outline of the subject. We hope that some day he will supply in another volume what is a real need. Furtwaengler's *Antike Gemmen* is of course masterly, but it is expensive, and also too elaborate for beginners. If this catalogue falls, as we hope it may, into the hands of many unfamiliar with the subject, they will certainly wish to pursue it; and we are sure also that if they read the text they will wish to have Mr. Beazley for their guide. Y.

#### THE OCTAVIUS OF MINUCIUS FELIX.

*The Octavius of Minucius Felix.* By J. H. FREESE. (Translations of Christian Literature. Series II. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge). Pp. ix-xxv + 27-98. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.

THE unique character of this dialogue gives it a special position in the literature of the early Church, and makes it of interest to a large number of readers. The writer, an advocate living at Rome, has put the case for Christianity in the shape of a dialogue between Caecilius Natalis, a Pagan, and Octavius, an adherent of the new faith. Octavius appears as a predecessor of Toland and Tindall, and the 'Christian Deists' of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He says little or nothing of dogma, but uses weapons drawn from ancient philosophers, and especially from Cicero, to attack Paganism. His main contention is *aut nunc Christianos philosophos esse aut philosophos fuisse iam tunc Christianos*. In his denunciation of Pagan fables he uses sceptical arguments against prodigies and miracles, which might have been turned against Christianity. It is not surprising that Lactantius and Jerome speak of his essay with lukewarm praise, feeling that he was a dangerous defender. It was indeed only preserved by an accident—viz., the confusion of *Octavius* with *octavus*—which caused it to be regarded as the eighth book of Arnobius *adversus gentes*. Of late years

it has been much studied, and its inclusion in this series of translations is thoroughly justified.

Mr. Freese's work is useful, though unpretending. In the Introduction he gives a short account of the main problems connected with the date and subject-matter of the dialogue. The translation is made from the text of Waltzing,<sup>1</sup> but he adopts several corrections from other scholars, which generally seem to be improvements. His rendering is neat and scholarly, and can be read with pleasure. It may, however, be doubted whether his short and smooth sentences will convey to the English reader the effect produced by the rhetorical and bejewelled periods of Minucius.

The exact date of Minucius is of great importance in view of the relationship between his work and the *Apology of Tertullian*, written in A.D. 197. It is held that one of the two writers must have copied the other. Accordingly, the *Octavius* has been referred by some writers to the second century A.D. and by others to the third. Support for the first view is to be found in the mention of Fronto as *Cirtensis noster* (chaps. ix., xxxi.), which might imply that he was still alive, while an inscription which shows that a certain Caecilius Natalis was a magistrate at Cirta in 210 A.D. is in favour of the later date. Mr. Freese does not mention

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Class. Rev.* 1914, p. 64.



a recent dissertation of F. di Capua,<sup>1</sup> who, after a metrical analysis of Minucius' prose, shows that he wrote in a style which was current in the third century—e.g. in Cyprian—but was unknown in the second. The question

of his date may therefore be regarded as settled. The tumidity of his diction is strongly in favour of the view that he, like his friend Natalis, was of African origin, although a dweller in Rome.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

*Corpus Christi College.  
Oxford.*

<sup>1</sup> *Didaskaleion* 1913, pp. 1-41.

### A NEW VERSE TRANSLATION OF LUCRETII.

*Lucretius on the Nature of Things.*

Translated from Latin into English verse by Sir ROBERT ALLISON.

Arthur L. Humphreys. 1919. 7s. 6d.

A VERSE translation of Lucretius is an heroic undertaking. It requires no exceptional courage to select, as Mr. Mallock did, or more recently Mr. Stebbing, the great sustained passages, such as the exordium or the conclusion of Book III., and render them as detached pieces; their own magnificence carries the translator through, and they are of a single mood. But to render the whole, to preserve the poetry of the long argument with its precision of wording, and the sudden flashes of vision—the *lumina ingenii*—and to weld this on to the passages of higher mood, so that the result is a continuous whole without breaks or changes—this is a task which requires unusual insight and no mean gift. Most modern scholars have shrunk from it and contented themselves with the medium of prose. Munro's prose is, indeed, of a high poetic quality, at any rate in places, but he would have found himself seriously hampered by verse, and for a parallel to Sir Robert Allison's undertaking we have to go back to Creech (1682) or Evelyn (1656)—and Evelyn stopped hort at the end of Book I.

There is this further difficulty for a twentieth-century translator, that whereas Evelyn, and in a lesser degree Creech, was the man of letters translating for the scholarly gentleman of good education, anyone attempting the task now has behind him all the critical work of the great Victorian scholars: he knows that the professional eye will be on him and that he must justify

himself as a scholar as well as a writer of verse. Sir Robert is well equipped for this task: he takes Munro's text as his base, but shows himself abreast of criticism by an occasional departure from it with good scholarly judgement (e.g. i. 469 'terris' OQ for Munro's 'Teucris'), and quotes in his notes from Martha, Merrill, Duff, and the *Classical Quarterly*. Yet even so he will be criticised professionally: in the first twenty lines I have noticed three places where I think he is 'wrong,' and others will have similar carping criticisms.

The effect of this critical atmosphere is almost inevitably that the modern translator will try to keep too close to his original: he will be careful of each word, he will let the reader see how he takes the passage, he will 'take sides in a *στάσις*' over a well-known crux, and though he can sometimes avoid the *minutiae* of rival solutions (e.g. i. 551)—and thereby expose himself to further criticism—he will not, as a rule, 'hedge.' Now in a prose translation all this can be done without loss of effect, but in verse the result is—and it can hardly be avoided—a certain sacrifice of the poetry of the original. Let me illustrate this. Take first a passage of obvious poetic vision, the comparison of the winds to the rushing torrent in i. 277-289. Read Evelyn:

*Winds* therefore unseen *bodies* are, which sweep  
The fleeting clouds, the Earth, the Azure deep,  
Bearing with sudden storm all things away,  
Yet thus proceeding, do they nought destroy  
Other than as the yielding water flows,  
Augmented by large showres, or melted snows  
Which from deep cliffs in *Cataracts* descend,  
Whole trees they float, and prostrate woods  
they rend,

Nor can strong Bridges their approach sustain,  
Whose rapid torrent do's all check disdain.

The River with immoderate showres repleat,  
Against their Piles impetuously does beat,  
Roaring it ruins, huge stones along it rowles,  
All things it spoyles, and nothing it controles.

You cannot tell here what he is translating in the two passages, where the text is disputed, nor what the last half-line represents, but this is poetry. Now try Creech:

There must be Bodies, tho unseen they be,  
Which thus disturb Heaven, Earth, Air and Sea;  
Which hardest Oaks and Rocks, and all things tear,  
And snatch them up in whirling thro the Air:  
They all rush on as headlong Rivers flow,  
Swollen big with falling showers, or melting snow;  
Those Rocks and Trees o' return, and mighty Beams,  
And whirl their conquer'd prey in rapid streams:  
No Bridge can check, no force the stream controle,  
It grows more wild and fierce, and beats the Mole:  
Ruine and Noise attend where'er it flows,  
It rolls great stones and breaks what dare oppose.

This halts more, and one knows what his text was in the last line, but it is good verse. Now turn to Sir Robert:

These are then, it would seem, these viewless winds,  
Endowed with bodies which you cannot see,  
Which sweep along the earth, the sea, the sky,  
And vex with sudden whirlwinds, nor do they Stream on and scatter havoc otherwise Than as the gentle force of water, where With sudden stream, augmented from the hills By heavy rains, it rushes from above Hurling the forest's wrack and mighty trees: Nor can the strong-built bridges ev'n endure Its sudden onset, driven by the floods The river rushes on the piles with all Its strength, spreads ruin with a roar, Displaces mighty stones, and sweeps away Whatever may impede its onward rush.

We can follow this word for word in the original and know that Sir Robert reads *quom* in l. 282. There is also considerable vigour and rugged force about it all, but it cuts up awkwardly into its measure and one wonders whether it would not have been more effective in prose.

Now take a short argumentative passage, part of the Magnet section in Book VI. 1042-1052. Read Sir Robert first:

Sometimes it happens that the iron recedes  
When it meets the stone, and ev'n is wont to fly

And follow in its turn. For I have seen  
Some iron rings in Samothrace jump up,  
And iron filings range in bowls of brass,  
The magnet stone being placed below: so

strong  
Was their desire to flee it. When the brass  
Then comes between, so great discord ensues,  
Because when the stream from it has seized upon

And blocked the iron's pores, then comes on it  
The stream from out the stone, and finds all full  
Within the iron, nor is there a path  
By which to go, as heretofore it did.

Once again we can follow in the text, and our critical sense even objects to the rendering 'in Samothrace'; but it is rather mechanical. We have not Evelyn here, but listen to Creech:

But more than this, coy *Steel* will sometimes move  
And flie the *striving* Stone, and cease to love.  
And thus *Steel* Filings I have often known,  
In little *brazen* Pots held o're the Stone,  
Will strive, and leap, as eager to be gone;  
Because the little *brazen* parts that rear,  
Fill all the *Steel's* small *Pores*, and settle there;  
And so the other rising *streams* that come  
From *Magnets*, find no way, no open room.

These are the limitations under which Sir Robert has worked. Modern scholarship would not have accepted a version as loose as that of Creech and Evelyn, yet accuracy must entail some loss. Having said this much one may express a genuine admiration for the real vigour and vitality of his translation, and the best test is that it can be read continuously with enjoyment. One soon gets into its own conventions and settings, and it conveys with peculiar success the sense of Lucretius' continuous effort, the eagerness of his argument, the striving for logical victory, and his supreme confidence in the issue. If the spirit of the poet is sometimes lacking, the spirit of the man is there. And in many of the greater passages of the poem—such as the end of the first book—Sir Robert rises to great heights: there is a swing and reality about his blank verse which could never have been attained in the more elegant couplets of his predecessors.

Sir Robert has added an interesting introduction, which will give the setting of the poem well to an English reader—though again one must object critically to the strange view taken of Cicero's

'*multae tamen artis*' on p. vii. A happy inspiration has led him to quote in footnotes parallels from English poetry, and to add in an Appendix some specimen translations of Epicurus, which

show the very unpromising material which Lucretius had to transform into Latin poetry.

C. BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

#### T. MACCI PLAUTI MENAECHEMI.

*T. Macci Plauti Menaechmi*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by CLARA M. KNIGHT, M.A., D.Litt., Cambridge University Press, 1919.

THE late Professor Leo, of Berlin, gave instructions in his will that his MS. lectures on the *Menaechmi* should be burned, apparently because he was dissatisfied with them. The beginner in Plautine criticism has no such scruples. He is inclined to trust his own judgment on difficult questions of scansion, text, and interpretation, only half aware that he is stepping *per ignes suppositos cineri doloso*. That Dr. Clara Knight is a beginner is obvious. I hope, then, that she will not resent frank criticism on the part of one who edited his first play of Plautus, with all its imperfections on its head, over forty years ago, and who now desires to put his riper experience at her disposal, when she comes to produce a second edition.

The literary part of the Introduction is well written. The editor has also made good use in her commentary of Bennett's Syntax of Early Latin, though she is not in touch with a good deal of recent work on the *Menaechmi*, e.g. Redslob's review of Niemeyer's revision of Brix (1892), and Niemeyer's still later revision (1912). The faults which I find in her work are concerned chiefly with metre and prosody. To begin with, I am not even sure that I know what Dr. Knight means when she says (Pref. p. vii) 'to mark the accent [*i.e.* the 'metrical accent'] throughout is unsound in principle; for it is certain to give a young student the impression that the metrical ictus is something apart from the natural accent of the words or word-groups.' What, then, is the metrical ictus? I suppose that Dr. Knight means to deny that ictus is a factor in Plautine verse, though I

observe that in § 13 (p. xxiv) she seems to attribute 'lengthening in arsi' to the ictus. On p. xix she says that the ictus generally coincides with the natural accent. But how about the cases where it does not? *Dedisti* in 689 (*cf. dedisse* in *Amph.* 761), *tacedum* written as one word in 348, and *eccum* in 275 are cases in point. No explanation is given: apparently shortening of a long and accented syllable is here attributed to ictus. [That there is a third alternative I have indicated in my article in *Class. Philology* VI. 1911, which I think Dr. Knight has not seen]. What are we to make of the statement that *datum* is to be scanned with a long *a* in 249, and that this form was 'perhaps common in early Latin'? In 249 *datum edis* must be scanned with hiatus. *Percipit*, 921, comes under Jacobsohn's law; so too *sincipit* in 506, and *validus* in 877. *Deférant* in 952 (p. xx) is quite unintelligible. Loss of final *s* in the examples given on p. xxi is an unnecessary supposition; for they fall under the ordinary law of shortening. Hiatus between *hominem* and *hominis* (so written with an impossible accent, p. xxii) in 1088 is based on a misunderstanding of Lindsay's note, who apparently scanned the line *Nam ego hominem hominis similiorum nunquam vidi alterum*; which is also to me intolerable. Either there is hiatus after *vidi*, or we must accept Lange's insertion of *ullum* or Onions' *usquam*. Monosyllabic *ille* in 337 and *istic* in 937 is an unnecessary assumption (p. xxiii); so too monosyllabic *fuit* in 370 and 409, and trisyllabic *voluisse* in 461. The statement (p. xxv) that Plautus did not understand the nature of the verse (iambic trimeter) in Greek should be amended: for the Greek comedians had gone great lengths in modifying the original triple time of the verse;

and the Old Latin dramatists (not Plautus only) deliberately adapted the metre to the conditions imposed by the Latin language. The scansion of 763 is quite uncertain (p. xxviii). Nor can I accept the scansion of 584 given on p. xxxi. Nor should Aristophanes *Equites* 1111-20 be quoted (p. xxx) to illustrate the 'colon Reizianum'; for these Greek lines have one syllable too much (except line 1120). How the editor intends lines 175 and 1028 to be scanned is left obscure.

The text and explanatory notes are also not free from defects. In 229 Lindsay's reading is adopted; but is it really suitable to the context? Surely Messenio must mean that there is a greater pleasure than to set foot on land, viz. to get back to one's native soil (*cf. non dicam dolo*, 'to tell the truth'). The second person *videas* also shows that the proposition is a general one. He does not mean 'I am even gladder to get ashore than I should be if I had reached home.' In 292 *certo* is said to be 'colloquial for classical *pro certo*.' Am I under some delusion? From boyhood I have regarded *certo scio*, 'I know for certain,' as a classical locution, which any examiner would accept in a Latin composition. The note on *ni* (419), calling attention to the ultimate identity of *ni* and *ne*, is spoiled by the absence of discrimination between the two meanings 'not' and 'if not.' *Truc.*

275 and *Rud.* 712 ff. should not be put side by side with *Men.* 880 f. In 110 and *Rud.* 1381 etc. *ni* cannot be translated by 'not.' In 1093 a note is wanted on the pres. indic. *invenis*: the usage in 1026 is different. Can Plautus really have written *Titanum* in 854, even though that word stands in the MSS. and is supported by Priscian? That Plautus knew what a Titan was is shown by *Persa* 26. Some of the notes on the subjunctive are good; e.g. on *ne comesses* 611. But in 397 *negem* is not 'potential'; nor is the note on attraction (line 111) luminous. What is meant by 'the modal colour'? The subj. is here postulative: *quod...videas* = 'if you see a thing.' It is a mistake to explain it as 'partaking of the potential force of *habeas*.' In 913 my emendation *ingero* seems to me preferable to Lindsay's *iungere* (from a supposed *iungus* = ζεύγος) or *unguine*: for 'an acre of hellebore' *cf. Hor. A.P.* 300 *tribus Anticyris*. In 466 *potine* = *potisne est* 'is it possible?', not 'can't you?' The statement that the Ambrosian MS. was first published by Studemund (p. 121) is likely to mislead the student. Small points like this are, of course, of no importance to the schoolboy; and I am glad to be able to add that he will find the explanatory notes for the most part adequate to his needs.

E. A. SONNENSCHIN.

#### POSTGATE'S PHAEDRI FABULAE AESOPIAE.

*Phaedri Fabulae Aesopiae cum Nicolai Perotti prologo et decem nouis fabulis, recognouit breuiter adnotatione critica instruxit IOHANNES PERCIVAL POSTGATE.* One vol. Crown 8vo. Pp. xxviii, no further pagination. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano, 1920. 4s. 6d. paper, 5s. cloth, 7s. 6d. interleaved, net.

DR POSTGATE'S is a purer text of Phaedrus than Lucian Mueller's and could hardly fail to be a purer than Mr Havet's; and the reason of its superiority is partly that he has used better judgment in choosing among the

lections at his disposal, and partly that he has imported fewer novelties of his own. A simple way to purify the text still further would be to remove those novelties: not that all of them are improbable or injurious, but most of them are, like most of Mueller's and Mr Havet's; and although Dr Postgate's conjectures do less harm than the former's and much less than the latter's, they also do less good. These fables are not a field in which anyone at this date can make 60 restorations, and Dr Postgate was not the critic most likely to make them. The matter and manner of Phaedrus are so plain and lucid that his correctors

have not been baffled or distracted by difficulties inherent in the author; they have been able to concentrate their scrutiny on his textual condition, and the scrutiny of Mr Havet has been uncommonly minute. The consequence is that most errors which can be set right with certainty have been set right already: there remains a vast deal of damage which is beyond repair. The licence of scribes who neither understood nor regarded the metre has bred such disorder that the words in the MSS are often far away from anything that the poet can have written, and editors accordingly have a large choice of possible corrections, few of which, for that very reason, will be probable. To handle a text of this sort is a business which calls for diffidence and flexibility: Dr Postgate is both sanguine and stubborn, and if once he gets hold of the stick by the wrong end he does not soon let go.

He has amended the punctuation of I 27 7; in III *epil.* 28 'excedit animus quem proposuit terminum' his *proposui* is an improvement; in IV 18 25 *odorem mixto* his *odore* is a slighter change than *mixtum* or *odores mixtos*; and in V 9 4 his *tu quam* for *quam* gives a better emphasis than *quam tu*. His *grana* in IV 24 14 is almost required by *congero*, though his derision of *granum* is beside the mark and shows that he has mistaken the author's meaning. *Mulum* in II 7 8 was justly condemned by Riese, and Dr Postgate's *ditem* is probably the best substitute that can be found. With the help of the medieval paraphrasts he has detected gaps after I 7 1 and *app. Perott.* 1 1, and has filled them with something very like what Phaedrus must have written.

In the following passages a variety of corrections are propounded by different critics, and each prefers his own: I will quote alternatives without interposing any judgment, and the reader shall try to pick out Dr Postgate's conjectures from the rest by their superiority. I 16 2 'fraudator homines cum aduocat sponsum improbos, | non rem expedire sed malauidere expetit': *malum inferre* or *ingerere* or *ordiri*. III 3 2 'usu peritus hariolo ueracior | uulgo causa fertur sed non dicitur': *esse fertur, causa*

or *perhibetur, causa*. III *epil.* 11 'et hoc minus ueniet ad me muneris': *perueniet* or *redibit*. IV 9 1 'homo simul ac uenit in magnum periculum (with title in *periculum simul ac uenit callidus*), | reperire effugium quaerit alterius malo': *homo in periculum simul ac uenit callidus* or *homo magnum ut uenit in periculum callidus* or *magnum in periculum simul ac uenit callidus*. IV 24 19 'aestate me laccessis; cum bruma est (PR, *cur bruma NV*) siles': *cum brumast* or *cum bruma*. *App.* 11 9 'ferendus esses, arte si te diceris | superasse qui esset melior uiribus': *qui te melior esset* or *quam tu qui esset m.* or *cum qui te esset m.* *App.* 16 6 'postquam esurire coepit fera societas': *e. societas coepit fera* or *fera esurire coepit s.* *App.* 29 1 'papilio uespam preteruolantem uiderat': *praeuolantem* or *prope uolantem*.

Similar cases, less handy to cite, may be found at I 5 7, 30 7, III *prol.* 22, III 10 2, 13 13, IV 6 2, and several places in the *appendix Perottina*. But there are others where Dr Postgate's expedient is quite evidently inferior. I 3 6-9, where he spoils the natural flow of the narrative, and II 4 19 cannot be dealt with briefly; but take the following examples.

III *prol.* 20 'quamuis in ipsa natus sim *pene* schola.' Heinsius mended nothing but the metre with his transposition *paene sim natus*: Mr Havet saw that *schola* needed definition, and altered *pene* to *Phoebi*: so *Phoebus* in Manil. IV 728 is corrupted to *Poenus* and *Paenus*, and *Phoebigenam* in Verg. *Aen.* VII 773 to *Poenigenam*. But Dr Postgate conceives the project of saving the letter *n*, and apparently with that single aim he writes *Pacanis*. This is not so apt a name as *Phoebi*, it is certainly no nearer to *pene*, and instead of mending the metre it requires the transposition of another word; 'doch die Katze, die Katz' ist gerettet.'

IV 2 4 'sed diligenter intueri has nenias: | quantam subtilis utilitatem reperies!' Pithoeus wrote *sub illis*, which procures unimpeachable sense by the irreducible minimum of change. Mr Havet's egotism forced him to prefer *sub titulis*, poor though it was; and against *sub illis* he said the first thing that came into his head, 'quod



post *has nefas*.' Dr Postgate knows that this is false, that *hic* and *ille* are referred to one object by writers so pure as Plautus and so elegant as Ovid; but the hunt is up and he cannot sit idle, he must venture in *pusillis*. Suppose that I were the author of this conjecture: does Dr Postgate think he would print it instead of Pithou's?

IV 17 8 'factus *periculosus tum* gubernator sophus: | "parce gaudere oportet et sensim queri.", *periculis tum* Orelli, *periculo sic* Dr Postgate, who says that Orelli's reading does not account for the -os- (as if his own accounted for the *tum*), and that the plural is inappropriate. The singular is inappropriate: the pilot, who had seen many a storm before, is contrasted with his less experienced and more impressionable shipmates.

These however are places where the tradition is corrupt: there are others where it is sound and where Dr Postgate vitiates it by alteration. His text of III *prol.* 45-8 checked me and threw me out as I read it, and before I had time to look at the note I had hit by conjecture on what I there found to be the MS reading; but not every corruption is so slight.

III 2 5 gives not only a good sense but exactly the right sense. A panther had fallen into a pit, and the country-folk came and threw stones at it; a few however were sorry for the poor creature, sure to die even if nobody molested it, *periturae quippe, quamvis nemo laederet*, and they threw it food instead. The panther after all made its escape in the night, and a day or two later it returned and fell with tooth and claw upon man and beast. When the soft-hearted few implored it to spare their lives, it answered them 'memini quis me saxo petierit, | quis panem dederit: uos timere absistite, | illis reuertor hostis *qui me laeserunt*,' 17-19. In spite of this fingerpost the meaning of *quamvis nemo laederet* was beyond the medieval paraphrasts, and they substituted *qui neminem laesit*, as if the beast of prey were an injured innocent; and upon this hint Dr Postgate writes *quamvis nullum laederet*, in which even the tense is wrong. That he cites the *qui me laeserunt* of verse 19

as bearing him out, and says that *nemo* injures the purpose of the story, and exclaims 'what a reason for compassion!' all serves to indicate his frame of mind; and so does his charge of 'more than questionable Latinity' against *periturae . . . quamvis . . . laederet* (for *laesurus esset*), which is the same construction as *dabunt quamvis redeant* in Hor. *carm.* IV 2 39. There is a fable in Phaedrus about a wolf and a lamb, written for those 'qui fictis causis innocentes opprimunt.'

IV *epil.* 7-9 'si non ingenium, certe breuitatem adproba, | quae commendari tanto debet iustius | quanto poetae sunt molesti ualidius.' Phaedrus says that his brevity is the more to his credit because he is one of a tedious tribe. This plain and excellent sense Dr Postgate somehow manages to miss; to fortify himself in error he calls *poetae* stupid and intolerable and says it completely stultifies the poem; and to have his own way he writes *cantores* instead. Such iron resolve may be a good thing in its proper place, but in criticism it is less desirable than perception and consideration.

V 10 6. The old hound 'obiectus hispidi pugnae suis | arripuit aurem, sed cariosis dentibus | praedam dimisit. *hic tunc* uenator dolens | canem obiurgabat.' *hic tunc* is both appropriate and idiomatic; but modern editors of Phaedrus are much too full of themselves to find that out, and when Mueller had conjectured *hoc tunc* and Mr Havet *dimisit hietans* it was more natural for Dr Postgate to write *ricтус* in emulation than to bethink himself of Hand Turs. III p. 79 or Mayor on Iuu. III 21. What he says against *hic tunc* is that it 'has no friends.'

At the end of *app.* 27 the medieval paraphrasts, not understanding what they read, have added *sic uerbis mutuo se deluserunt* or similar absurdities. Dr Postgate makes this into a verse, *sic uerbis illi se luserunt inuicem*, marks the poem as mutilated, and calls it 'an ironical composition in which the mutual insincerities of a pair of lovers are transfixed.' It treats of no such matter: all the insincerity is on one side.

I think that Dr Postgate is rather

too fond of these paraphrasts. Their *altitonans* or *Iuppiter intonans ab aethere* at I 2 28 does not justify him in writing *Tonans* for *deus*: it seems to be merely a poetical gewgaw like the others in Mr Havet's notes on I 3 11 and 12 9. At I 21 5, instead of *ad eum*, which is in the MSS and the paraphrasts as well, he writes *spumans*, which is only in the paraphrasts. A more plausible and certainly ingenious conjecture is '*quae* (better *cui*) *dorsum cum tutudisset inuitae diu*,' based on their *tundens dorsum eius*, for the '*quam dorso cum tulisset inuita et diu*' of the MSS at *app.* 24 2. In the attempt to reconstruct lost fables of Phaedrus from the prose of the paraphrases he has taken more pains than his predecessors and practised more self-restraint.

Dr Postgate has shown on other occasions that his ear for the Latin iambic is not perfect, and some of his conjectures here are metrically insecure or vicious. Phaedrus has no such verses as the *illius se miscere antidoto toxicum* and the *Demetrius rex qui Phalereus dictus est* which he offers at I 14 8 and V 1 1, nor as the *ego illius pro semita feci uiam* which he adopts from Johnson at III *prol.* 38; and *fab. nou.* 8 1 is astonishing. At *app.* 12 4 he fills out the verse by inserting *ea* before *ait*: there are probably more than two such elisions in Latin poetry, but I have only noticed two, and neither is in Phaedrus.

The preface gives a clear and comprehensive account of the MSS and the other sources of the text, and the papers in British and American journals of the last two years to which the reader is constantly referred contain matter of value. An orderly and intelligible apparatus criticus, as several

volumes of this series have shown, is a gift not always to be expected from an English editor. Dr Postgate's notes on I 19 7, 28 5, IV 9 5, 17 8 and 10, 18 14, 20 15, V 5 1, *app.* 13 25, 14 10, 15 10, appear to have been written before he knew what his text was going to be, or after he had forgotten what it was. Some of them, e.g. I 28 5, are merely wrong-end-foremost and cause nothing worse than annoyance and delay. Others tell us things which we could infer for ourselves and hide from us things which we cannot: that P has *catulos posset* in I 19 7 might have been said by silence, but who is to know that D has *posset catulos*? The MS reading is not discoverable from the notes on III *prol.* 22 and *app.* 9 2, nor the source of the text from those on III 19 8, IV 17 10, V 5 1, *app.* 9 2, 15 10. The note on III *prol.* 20 contains a wrong statement, and those on III 6 2 and *app.* 4 22 must inevitably mislead. Such particulars as '*xystum* Salmasius, *xistum* P' and '*umor* Havet, *humor* NV' could better be spared than the information that *ni* in *app.* 15 8 is a correction of Mueller's and the MSS have *nisi*. A part of the notes on IV 17 belongs to 16, and there are misprints or other slips in the apparatus at I 12 1, 21 2, 22 8, 26 4, II 3 2, 9 18, IV 1 6, 15 13, *app.* 20 3, and in the text (apart from errors of punctuation) at *app.* 25 2. The name of Heinsius is missing at I 13 13 sq., and Jannelli's rather than Mueller's should appear at *app.* 7 4. The conjecture *logis* ascribed to me at III *prol.* 37 had been anticipated, though I cannot say by whom; and I do not remember proposing *frondosum* in *app.* 6 2.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

## SHORT NOTICES

Texts for Students. No. 1: *Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius*, illustrative of Christianity in the First Century. Arranged by H. J. WHITE, D.D. Pp. 16. S.P.C.K. 3d. net. No. 2: *Selections from Matthew Paris*. Edited by CAROLINE A. J. SKEEL. Pp. 64. S.P.C.K. 9d. net. No. 3: *Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis*. Edited by CAROLINE A. J. SKEEL. Pp. 64. S.P.C.K. 9d. net. No. 4: *Libri Sancti Patricii*. A Revised Text, with a Selection of Various Readings. Edited by NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D. Pp. 32. S.P.C.K. 6d. net.

THIS series of Biblical, Patristic, and Historical Greek and Latin texts, designed primarily for school use, will doubtless have a wider circulation. How far school authorities will be persuaded to expedite a return to the old-time study of late Latin writers is highly problematical. Certainly the Latin studies in our schools of former days were by no means restricted to those books ordinarily esteemed as classics, but had even a far wider range than the course which the general editors of this series seem to contemplate—e.g. Alex. Neville's history of the Norfolk Rebellion in 1549 (*De Furoribus*) was only one among the famous Latin books appointed by Queen Elizabeth to be read in schools. Each of these 'Texts for Students' has a short Introduction, and words not ordinarily found in the Latin Dictionary are given either in glossaries or footnotes.

C. H. EVELYN-WHITE.

Rampton, Cambridge.

*Translations of Christian Literature.* Series I. Greek Texts: *The Lausiaca History of Palladius*. By W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, B.D. Pp. 188. S.P.C.K. 5s. net.

MR. LOWTHER CLARKE has accomplished a not altogether easy task in a manner that will commend his discreet translation to a wide circle of readers

by whom the work will be generally welcomed. Up to the present the English student has had to content himself with the translation from the Syriac by Dr. Wallis Budge, which, while it may be said to possess peculiar merit, has left a clear way for a sound and direct translation from the original. The work is known to be one of very real interest, and abounds with curious historical matter. If, as Mr. Lowther Clarke says, in his admirable introduction, 'it is a salutary experience to read the Lausiaca History,' it is certainly an advantage to possess so strange an insight into the conditions of early monachism, that notwithstanding the many extravagant and improbable stories here related, present us with a picture of courage and heroic endurance that surpasses the ordinary imagination. A point of some little interest occurs in Chapter XXXI., where we read of a certain virgin, Piamoun, 'who lived the years of her life with her mother eating every other day (*μία νηὶν παρὰ μία νηὶν*) in the evening,' which Butler renders 'once a day' (rejected by Turner). We would suggest 'day by day,' and the allusion probably to the ordinary course of life being followed without direct reference to an anomaly. There are numerous scholarly and entertaining notes. The translation is based upon the text of Abbot Butler.

*A Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases.* By J. C. HOPPIN. 8vo. Vol. II. Pp. viii + 602; 221 Illustrations in Text (line and half-tone). Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1912. 35s. net.

THERE is little to add to the review of the first volume of this book, which appeared in the *Classical Review*, 1919, November-December. Professor Hoppin has completed a laborious and useful task. Eighty vase-painters are included in this volume. The indices are full and adequate, and render the

whole work of great practical value. The book should now prove of the utmost use to the student of vases for reference in museums. He has in it a handbook, which enables him to look up on the spot any vase which has been attributed to a definite painter, and to compare immediately his own views with the attributions of others. Without the book much note-taking and hunting of references would be necessary to produce the same result. References in the indices are given not to pages, but to painters and to their vases, as numbered in the book. This being so, it is a pity that the names of painters were not added as headings to each page. This would have saved the student's time. Otherwise the book is as conveniently arranged as it could be.

E. M. W. T.

*Horace and His Age: A Study in Historical Background.* By J. F. D'ALTON, M.A., D.D., Professor of Ancient Classics, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth.

THIS must be considered a compilation, but it is likely to be useful, and it is undoubtedly interesting. It justifies itself by the wide and careful reading which has been brought to bear on it. Horace is of all the Roman poets the one whose life and opinions, changing and maturing in the course of years, and reflecting all along the habits and ideas of his contemporaries, need, if we would draw from him all he has to tell us, a commentary even more bulky than that of Mayor on Juvenal. But Professor D'Alton does not give us a bulky commentary. His aim is to put Horace in an atmosphere of Roman thought, Roman habits, Roman politics, so that the student who has become quite at home in this atmosphere may return to the poems feeling that he knows something at least about the environment of a very interesting character. His object, in fact, is not so much to make Horace tell the story of his time as to make the time tell the story of Horace's life. The plan is a good one, though it would not suit another poet equally well. Horace, for example, in Chapter I., is considered in his relation to the *Welt-politik* of his time, not so much to elicit

his own opinions or those of his friends in authority, as to put him in the right atmosphere for our understanding of both himself and his time. (Just to illustrate what is meant, we may remember how Mr. Hardy in his best novels surrounds his characters with an atmosphere which prompts or modifies their thinking.) So, too, in successive chapters, with religion, philosophy, social problems, and literary criticism.

Professor D'Alton is well read in all recent books about these matters, and acknowledges his obligations conscientiously. But in one sense he is more than a compiler, for he knows his Horace personally, and has a real admiration for him: 'The poet was essentially a man of many moods, quick-tempered and sensitive, as changing as the hues of an autumn sunset across the Roman Campagna. Our aim should be, not to assign him a complete system of philosophy, but to catch and, if possible, explain those passing moods.' Such a passage may convince the reader of this brief notice of the literary value of this book.

One or two special points may be mentioned. There should surely be an index to the poems as they are quoted in the text. For inscriptions the student should be put on the track of Dessau or even the *Corpus* itself; as it is, Mr. Rushforth's small volume seems to be the only one quoted. In writing of Ode I. xiv. he does not mention Dr. Leaf's attractive theory (*Journal of Philology*, Vol. XXXIV.), but he may well have missed it. His remarks on the *Fortuna* Ode (p. 111 ff.) are independent and interesting. He thinks it a strange medley of incoherent ideas; and he notes that nothing that has come to light on *Fortuna* of late years explains the mystery. On p. 126, accounting for the abandonment of ode-writing after the first three books were published, he seems to exaggerate the trifling nature of Horace's lyrics. But as the poet grew older was it not the technical difficulty of ode-writing, of skilfully adapting the Latin tongue to the subtleties of Greek lyric measures, that deterred him and made him feel happier and easier with hexameters? To combine deftness with an apparent spontaneity is perhaps a gift of youth.

## VERSION.

TO-MORROW, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,  
 Creeps in this petty pace from day to day  
 To the last syllable of recorded time,  
 And all our yesterdays have lighted fools  
 The way to dusty death. Out, out,  
 brief candle!  
 Life's but a walking shadow, a poor  
 player  
 That struts and frets his hour upon the  
 stage  
 And then is heard no more: it is a tale  
 Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,  
 Signifying nothing.

Αδριον ἐκδέχεται καὶ ἐς αἶριον αἶριον ἄλλο,  
 εἰς πυμάτην μνήμην ὠγυγίων ἐτέων  
 ἡμαρ ἐπ' ἡματι βαῖνον ἀεὶ βραδύπου· τὰ δὲ πάντα  
 χθιζὺνὰ μύροισιν φῶτ' ἐπέλαμψε βροτοῖς  
 οἶμον ἐποιχομένους κόνιν εἰς 'Αἶδαο· σὺ δ' οὖν μοι  
 ἔρρε κατεσβηκῶς, λύχν' ὀλιγοχρόνιε  
 τίς γὰρ δῆθ' ὁ βίος; σκιὰ ἐμπνοῦς, ἥ 'πὶ τραγυδοῖς  
 φαῦλος ἀγωνιστῆς, δς τερατευόμενος  
 βαῖα μὲν ἐν σκηνῇ βρενθύεται, εἶτα δὲ χοῦτος  
 σιγῆσαν τοῦνθένδ' ἐξέπειο· ἤθε λόγος  
 δν παράφρων στωμύλλει ἀνὴρ, δεινὸν μὲν ἀκούειν  
 καὶ μάλα σεμνολόγον, νοῦς δ' ἄρα μήτις εὐήν.

H. RACKHAM.

*Christ's College, Cambridge.*

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE Summer School for the Reform of Latin Teaching will be held this year at Chester, from Monday, August 30 to Wednesday, September 8. Information can be had of the Secretary, Mr. N. Parry, 4, Church Street, Durham.

WITH the close of the current volume the present editors of the *Classical Review*, Dr. W. H. D. Rouse and Dr. A. D. Godley, will have completed ten years' work in that capacity. In announcing their retirement next December, the Classical Journals Board

desires to offer them its cordial thanks for their able and generous service to the cause of classical studies through a period of unique difficulty; and it is confident that in so thanking them it is representing the unanimous feeling of the readers of the *Review*.

Mr. J. T. Sheppard, Fellow and Tutor of King's College, Cambridge, and Mr. R. W. Livingstone, Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, have accepted the invitation of the Board to become the editors for 1921; and to one of them all contributions to the pages of the *Review* should be addressed after November 1, 1920.

## CORRESPONDENCE

LIDDELL AND SCOTT.

*To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.*

MR. CORNFORD'S letter in your last issue is easily answered. A new edition of Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* is in preparation, and it is hoped that printing may begin fairly soon. I shall therefore be glad to receive any corrections or notes of omissions, etc., which may have been made by readers of the *Classical Review*. It is hoped that obvious errors have for the most part been detected in the course of revision, but omissions easily escape notice, and I shall be glad if your readers would notify me of any such. Papyri, recently discovered inscriptions, etc., have been specially read for the new edition, as well as a large number of authors of the later periods; but there are

doubtless many references to the earlier classical literature which should be inserted, especially where texts have been improved by recent editors. To give an example: it is not long since my attention was drawn to the reading ἀνικμάμενα adopted (no doubt rightly) by Professor Burnet in Plato, *Timaeus* 53A, which had escaped notice. Notes on such matters will be gratefully received; also on interpretations generally adopted by recent scholars which mark an advance on those recognised by Liddell and Scott. Mr. Cornford's note on 'Ενδεξιόμαι is a typical example.—Yours faithfully,

H. STUART JONES.

*Brasenose College,  
Oxford.*



## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\* \* Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- A Guide to the Exhibition Illustrating Greek and Roman Life.* 2nd Edition.  $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. viii + 232. London: British Museum, 1920. Paper boards, 2s. 6d.
- Allen (J. T.) *The Greek Theatre of the Fifth Century before Christ.*  $6\frac{1}{4}'' \times 9\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. x + 118. 31 illustrations. Berkeley: University of California. Cloth.
- Amos (Flora R.) *Early Theories of Translation.*  $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. xiv + 184. Oxford: University Press, 1920. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- A National System of Education.*  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 78. London: Longmans, 1920. Paper, 1s. net.
- Apologétique de Tertullien.* By J. P. Waltzing.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 147. Liège: Imp. H. Vaillant-Carmanné, 1919. Paper, 10 frs.
- Aron (Kurt). *Beiträge zu den Persern des Timotheos: Dissertation für Doctorate.*  $6'' \times 9''$ . Pp. 48. Greifswald, 1920.
- Cadbury (H. J.) *The Style and Literary Method of Luke: I. The Diction of Luke and Acts.* Harvard Theological Studies, VI.  $6'' \times 9''$ . Pp. vi + 72. Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Clark (A. C.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes.*  $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. 248. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Cloth, 3s. net; paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Courthope (W. J.) *The Country Town and other Poems.*  $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 107. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Dickens (Guy). *Hellenistic Sculpture.*  $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 8''$ . Pp. 99 + 53 Plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Paper boards, 16s. net.
- Eitrem (S.) *Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte.* III.  $10\frac{3}{4}'' \times 7''$ . Pp. 204. Kristiania: Dybwad, 1920.
- Fiske (G. C.) *Lucilius and Horace.*  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 524. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1920. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Foucart (M. P.) *Un Décret Athénien Relatif aux combattants de Phyle.*  $11\frac{1}{4}'' \times 9''$ . Pp. 35. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1920. Paper, 2 fr. 50 + 75 per cent.
- Frank (Tenny). *An Economic History of Rome to the end of the Republic.*  $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. xii + 312. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1920. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Fresc (J. H.) *The Library of Photius.* Vol. I.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. xiv + 243. London: S.P.C.K., 1920. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Grieksch Woordenboek.* By Dr. F. Muller, Junr.  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. xx + 1248. Groningen: Wolters, 1920. Cloth, 13'90 frs.
- Hardie (W. R.) *Res Metrica.*  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. xii + 275. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- How to Observe in Archaeology.*  $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. 103. London: British Museum, 1920. Cloth.
- Ibis.* See Rostagni.
- Jones (H. S.) *Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy.*  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 39. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Kern (O.) *Orpheus.*  $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. 69. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1920. Paper M. 5.
- Latin Teaching.* Vol. III., No. 2.  $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 24. Durham: N. O. Parry, 4, Church Street. May, 1920. Paper, 1s.
- Marshall (F. H.) *Discovery in the Greek Lands.*  $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. xi + 127. Cambridge: University Press, 1920. Half cloth, paper boards, 8s. 6d. net.
- McClees (Helen). *A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions.*  $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 52. New York: Columbia University Press, 1920.
- Meyer (P. M.) *Juristische Papyri.*  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. xx + 380. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1920. Paper, M. 22.
- Mulder (J. J. B.) *Questiones nonnullae ad Atheniensium matrimonium vitamque Coniugalem pertinentes (Dissertation for Doctorate).*  $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. xii + 152. Ad Rhenum: L. E. Bosch et Fil.
- Neue Jahrbücher.* Edited by J. Ilberg. Vols. XLV.-XLVI. Parts 1-4.  $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ . Leipzig: Teubner, 1920. Paper.
- Norwood (G.) *Greek Tragedy.*  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. vii + 394. London: Methuen, 1920. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Pallis (A.) *To the Romans.*  $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. 189. Liverpool Booksellers' Co., 1920. Cloth.
- Revista di Coltora.* Vol. I., No. 1., April 15, 1920.  $10'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. 48. Rome: Maglione and Strini. Paper, L. 3.50.
- Rostagni (A.) *Ibis. Contributi alla scienza dell' antichità pubblicati da G. de Sanctis: E. L. Paretti.* Vol. III.  $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 7''$ . Pp. 124. Firenze: Monnier, 1920.
- Seneca. *Index Verborum quae in Senecae Fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur a W. A. Oldfather, A. S. Pease, H. V. Canter Confectus.*  $10\frac{1}{4}'' \times 7''$ . Pp. 214. Part I., \$2; Parts II. and III., \$1.50 each.
- Smith (K. F.) *Martial the Epigrammatist and other Essays.*  $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5''$ . Pp. vi + 172. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1920. Cloth, \$2.
- Stace (W. T.) *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy.*  $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ . Pp. xiv + 386. London: Macmillan, 1920. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- The Agamemnon of Aeschylus.* Translated by Gilbert Murray.  $7'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$ . Pp. xiv + 91. London: Allen and Unwin. Paper, 2s. net; cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- The Minor Poems of Vergil.* Translated by J. J. Mooney.  $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ . Pp. vii + 121. Birmingham: Cornish Bros., 1920. Paper boards, 4s. 6d. net.
- The Oedipus Tyrannus of Sophocles.* Translated by J. T. Sheppard.  $9'' \times 6''$ . Pp. xxix + 179. Cambridge: University Press, 1920. Cloth, 20s. net.
- University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature.* Vol. IV., Nos. 2, 3, 4. Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
- Van der Hagen (O. J.) *De Clementis Alexandrini.*  $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6''$ . Pp. xi + 114. O. J. Van der Hagen, Beme-Abbey Heeswijk, N. B. Holland, 1920. Paper.

